



University
of Glasgow

van Eyk, John (2019) *"O Blessed and Thrice Glorious Lord Jesus": Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680) and the threefold glory of the second person of the Trinity*. MTh(R) thesis.

<http://theses.gla.ac.uk/75084/>

Copyright and moral rights for this work are retained by the author

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge

This work cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given

Enlighten: Theses

<https://theses.gla.ac.uk/>
research-enlighten@glasgow.ac.uk

“O Blessed and Thrice Glorious Lord Jesus”

Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)

and the Threefold Glory

of

the Second Person of the Trinity

John van Eyk

BCS, MDiv

Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the

Degree of Master of Theology (Research)

University of Glasgow

in partnership with Edinburgh Theological Seminary

October 2019

Abstract

This Thesis examines the Christology of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680). It notes that he identifies that the second Person of the Trinity has a threefold glory. He has (i) a glory as he is God, which Goodwin terms his essential glory. Christ also has a double glory as the God-man, (ii) the glory of his person, and, (iii) the glory that accrues to him because of his mediatorial work.

After examining Goodwin's explication of the threefold glory of Christ, the thesis demonstrates that the personal glory of the God-man, abstracted from his mediatorial work, is central in his Christology.

The thesis concludes that there is a speculative element in Goodwin's insistence that Christ was predestined as the God-man antecedent to any consideration of the creation and fall of man, leading him to bifurcate his Person and work. This, however, does not overthrow the whole of his Christology nor the pastoral usefulness of his teaching. In fact, Thomas Goodwin makes an important contribution to our understanding of the 'thrice glorious Lord Jesus.'

Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: The Essential Glory of the Second Person of the Trinity	6
Chapter 2: The Mediatorial Glory of the God-man	15
Chapter 3: The Personal Glory of the God-man	37
Chapter 4: The Centrality of the Personal Glory of the God-man	51
Chapter 5: An Analysis and Critique of Goodwin's Christology	70
Appendix A:	95
Bibliography	100

Acknowledgements

Blessed be the thrice glorious Christ who gave pastors and teachers as gifts to his Church when he ascended on high.

I thank him for Thomas Goodwin, D.D., who has been an instrument wielded by the Holy Spirit to help many, including myself, love Christ more.

I also owe a debt to Dr Sinclair B Ferguson for his encouragement not only to begin but also to complete this thesis.

The Lord Christ has not only blessed me through pastors and teachers but has called me to join their ranks. I am grateful for the enormous privilege of serving Riverside Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (Cambridge, Canada), Tain/Fearn Associated Presbyterian Church (Scottish Highlands), and Trinity Reformed Church (Lethbridge, Canada). One of the motivations in undertaking this study was to enable me to preach the incomparable Christ better to the people of God.

Finally, to my dear wife Lucy and loving children and grandson, my grateful thanks. The Lord has made me very glad through you. I am thankful for your partnership in the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be all the glory, both now and forever.

Introduction

Thomas Goodwin (1600-80) was an English Puritan pastor and theologian. Although now less studied than his younger contemporary John Owen (1616-83) he was ranked alongside him as a principal leader of Seventeenth Century Independency, the two of them labelled by Anthony à Wood as ‘the two Atlases and patriarchs of independency.’¹

Life²

Goodwin was born prematurely on the 5th of October, 1600 to pious parents, Richard and Catherine Goodwin, in the Norfolk village of Rollesby. From his own memoirs, edited by his son, we learn that he had spiritual impressions from a young age, including weeping over his sin and ‘good motions and affection of love to God and Christ.’³

When he reached the age of 12 he entered Christ’s College, Cambridge and sat under the ministry of Richard Sibbes, the Puritan preacher who would later say to him, ‘Young man, if you ever would do good, you must preach the gospel and the free grace of God in Christ Jesus.’⁴

Goodwin received the sacrament of Communion at Easter when he was fourteen years old and confessed: ‘The love of God to such a sinner, and Christ’s dying for me, did greatly affect me.’⁵ But discouraged in his spiritual development by an offhand remark of his tutor, Goodwin stopped attending Sibbes’s sermons and lectures, ceased praying and reading ‘sound divinity.’⁶ For a period of six years thereafter he struggled spiritually. He studied to become a successful preacher and flirted with Arminianism. Recognising his spiritual condition ‘was neither right nor sound,’⁷ prior to every sacrament he would seek

¹ à Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, 98.

² This biographical material was gleaned from the two memoirs found in the beginning of *Works* 2:vii-lxxv. The first was written by Robert Halley, D.D., and the second by Goodwin’s son, Thomas Goodwin. This volume 2 is from *The Works of Thomas Goodwin*, 12 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1861-66, [Reprinted] Eureka, CA: Tanski Publications, 1996. Note: subsequent references to Goodwin in this thesis will be noted in the following format: *Shortened treatise title, Works*, volume number:page number.

³ *Memoir*, *Works* 2:lii.

⁴ *Memoir*, *Works* 2:lxxi.

⁵ *Memoir*, *Works* 2:lii.

⁶ *Memoir*, *Works*, 2:liii.

⁷ *Memoir*, *Works* 2:liii.

to correct his spiritual state, and repent and turn to God—but only to return to his prayerlessness and sinful lifestyle. One day, after a move to Catherine Hall, while he was on his way to party with some friends he was drawn by the tolling of the funeral bell at St Edmund’s Church to hear the sermon. After taking a seat in the church he regretted his decision to come. He despised preaching and would have left but ‘shame made me stay.’⁸ God used the sermon and shortly thereafter Goodwin was converted.

For several years after his conversion he ‘was diverted from Christ . . . to search only into the signs of grace in me.’⁹ But in conference with Mr Price of Lynn, a minister whom Goodwin describes as ‘the greatest man for experimental acquaintance with Christ that he ever met with,’¹⁰ he was led ‘into the spirit of the gospel to live by faith in Christ, and to derive from him life and strength for sanctification, and all comfort and joy through believing.’¹¹

After his graduation from Cambridge, Goodwin was ordained in the Church of England. Concluding that the New Testament taught a Congregationalist form of church polity, he sought to reform the Church around particular congregations composed of true or visible saints. During the Laudian period he went to the Netherlands, first settling in Amsterdam in 1639 before serving an Independent Congregation in Arnhem.

He returned to England in 1641 to pastor a congregation in London, and in 1643 was appointed to sit at the Westminster Assembly where he led the small but vocal group of Independent ministers. With the death of Charles I in 1649 and the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell, Goodwin’s star rose. He was appointed President of Magdalene College, Oxford and served there until the restoration of the monarchy in 1660. Following the Act of Uniformity (1662) Goodwin retired from high-visibility public life to pastor an Independent Congregation in Fetter Lane, London.

Christ was the focus of Thomas Goodwin’s preaching. His son remarks that in the years following the restoration of the king and his father’s retirement from public life he studied primarily the Scriptures: ‘The love and free grace of God, the excellencies and

⁸ *Memoir, Works 2*:liv.

⁹ *Memoir, Works 2*:lxviii.

¹⁰ *Memoir, Works 2*:lxviii.

¹¹ *Memoir, Works 2*:lxviii.

glories of our Lord Jesus Christ, were the truths in which his mind soared with greatest delight.’¹²

In February 1680 Goodwin was seized by a fever which, after a few days, ended his life. In his dying hours he had ‘strength of faith and assurance of Christ’s love.’¹³ He confessed: ‘Christ cannot love me better than he doth; I think I cannot love Christ better than I do.’¹⁴ He died on 23 February 1680.

The Christ from whom Goodwin was first diverted after his conversion but in whom he trusted and whose ‘excellencies and glories’ thrilled him, figures prominently in Goodwin’s theology. Indeed, he urged all fellow Christians ‘to have Jesus Christ continually in one’s eye, an habitual sight of him.’¹⁵

Focus of this Study

This Christocentric theology is the central focus of this study. Goodwin was a prolific writer, whose works fill twelve volumes, 6680 pages in total. Yet, despite widespread recognition of his significance there have been few studies on his Christology. Mark Jones comments that the title formerly used of Goodwin’s Oxford colleague, John Owen, ‘“the forgotten man of English theology”’ is now more appropriately spoken of Thomas Goodwin.’¹⁶ While Jonathan Mark Carter notes that ‘[t]o date nine doctoral theses have been completed on Goodwin,’¹⁷ several focus on Goodwin’s Congregational Church polity and his views on the Holy Spirit and assurance of faith.

¹² *Memoir, Works* 2:lxixiv.

¹³ *Memoir, Works* 2:lxixiv.

¹⁴ *Memoir, Works* 2:lxixv.

¹⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 2:411.

¹⁶ Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 5.

¹⁷ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 1.

The doctoral theses most germane to the topic of the present study were written by Mark Jones¹⁸ and Jonathan Carter.¹⁹ Karl Jones refers to an unavailable work by D I Childs entitled *Thomas Goodwin's Teaching on the Person and Work of Christ*.²⁰

Jones focusses on how Goodwin's Christology 'is grounded in, and flows out of, the eternal intratrinitarian covenant of redemption, also known as the *pactum salutis*.'²¹ He highlights the mediatorial work of redemption accomplished by the eternal Son of God who became man, rightly noticing the tight connection that Goodwin draws between the person and work of Christ in relation to his work of redemption. For Goodwin 'who Christ is and what Christ does are inextricably intertwined.'²² Christ's work cannot be understood apart from his person. What is less prominent in Jones's thesis, however, is that, for Goodwin, Christ's person can be understood apart from his work. For Jones, Goodwin's answer to Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo?* is only significant as seen through soteriological categories, more specifically, as part of the *pactum salutis*.

Jonathan Mark Carter considers Jones's work a 'welcome contribution' but notes that 'Jones fails to discern Goodwin's fundamental answer to the chief research question—"Why did God become man?"'²³ He attempts to correct Jones by noting the prominence in Goodwin's Christology of the category of union with Christ, particularly, union with the Person of Christ, as Head of his Church. Carter rightly notes the primacy of Christ's headship over his office of redeemer in Goodwin's Christology. However, he does not highlight that for Goodwin, Christ's headship is seen primarily in ontological categories rather than in hamartiological ones, even if, as Carter notes, Christ's headship is significant in understanding Goodwin's Christology relative to the believers' union with Christ in the accomplishment and application of salvation.

¹⁸ Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*.

¹⁹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*.

²⁰ Karl R B Jones, *The Theology of Joy*, 12. Unfortunately, Childs was never able to finish the revisions required due to ill-health. The University of Cardiff awarded the PhD posthumously.

²¹ Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 292.

²² Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 293.

²³ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 18.

Neither Jones nor Carter, however, gives attention to the striking emphasis in Goodwin's Christology on the triple glories of Christ and their relationship to one another. This is the focus of the present thesis.

Given both the posthumous nature of the publication of most of Goodwin's works (making it difficult to trace influences on his thinking) and also the complexities of Goodwin's Christological thinking, the earlier chapters are essentially expository and seek to clarify his teaching, reserving more detailed analysis and critique until the final chapter.

Chapter 1 will explore Goodwin's teaching on the *essential* glory of Christ, the eternal Son of God. This exploration will also interact with Goodwin's trinitarian views.

Chapter 2 will explore Goodwin's teaching on the *mediatorial* glory of Christ. Here we will discuss Goodwin's use of both Scotist and Anselmic categories as he engages with Christ's mediatorial work in relation to the *pactum salutis*.

Chapter 3 will focus on the *personal* glory of Christ, the God-man.

Chapter 4 will seek to elucidate what has been latent in the previous chapters, namely, Goodwin's view that Christ's personal glory is the chief glory of the God-man.

Chapter 5, will assess and critique Goodwin's Christology by situating him within the theological tradition regarding Anselm's question, *Cur Deus Homo?*, and comparing his answer with that of the Genevan Reformer, John Calvin, and Goodwin's one-time Oxford colleague, John Owen. Goodwin's exegesis of significant passages that influence his Christology will be compared with that of other contemporary divines and evaluated in light of the classical Reformed principle of 'good and necessary consequence.' In this way both the notable strengths and potential weaknesses in Goodwin's remarkable exposition of the glory of Christ will be indicated.

Chapter 1: The Essential Glory of the Second Person of the Trinity

When Thomas Goodwin discusses the glory that belongs to the second Person of the Trinity, he does so under three headings:

And indeed Christ hath a threefold glory. The first essential, the same with God his Father, he the Son being co-equal to him, God of God, and very God. The second, belonging to his person, as now constituted God-man. . . . Thirdly, The glory of his mediatorship acquired by himself.¹

Since the essential glory of Christ is foundational for Goodwin's discussion of Christ's personal and mediatorial glories, in our travel with Goodwin, this will be our first port of call.

Essential Glory Foundational to Personal and Mediatorial Glory

While it is true, as Mark Jones notes, that the 'essential glory of the divine Son receives relatively little attention in Goodwin's exposition on Christ's glory compared to the twofold glory related to his person and work as God-man,'² the scant attention paid is not indicative of its importance in his theology. In Goodwin's Christology, the Son's essential glory is the foundation of and prerequisite for his personal and mediatorial glories. Christ's essential glory as a member of the Trinity is the '*substratum* and foundation' of his glory as God-man³ because in Jesus Christ 'dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.'⁴

Likewise, Christ's mediatorial glory depends on his essential glory as the Son of God because, as we shall discover, the value of Christ's satisfaction depends on the worth of his person. Only one who is God can be an adequate mediator between God and man.

¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:494.

² Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 255.

³ *Knowledge, Works* 4:461.

⁴ Col 2:9. As the Authorised Version is the Bible which Thomas Goodwin used, all subsequent Scripture references will be to this version.

Goodwin's Exposition of the Trinity

What does Goodwin mean when he speaks of the second person's essential glory? To answer that question requires looking first at Goodwin's exposition of the Trinity, his fullest exposition of which can be found in Book I of his work *The Knowledge of God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ*.⁵

A. There is One God

Goodwin begins with the One, highlighting God's own testimony of his oneness in Deuteronomy 6:4 (Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD) coupled with God's declaration in Isaiah 44:8 (Is there a God beside me? yea, there is no God; I know not any). Additionally, if things are as God says, '[w]e need not seek out many reasons: one God, and one sufficient reason for it is enough . . . that there is not room or space for two immense beings, diverse from each other.'⁶

B. The One God Exists in Three Persons

Having begun with the One, Goodwin next discusses the Three. Though the Godhead is one, the persons within this Godhead are more than one, namely three. He says that it is proper to say that each person of the Godhead is God but we

must be wary of saying there are three Gods; that would sound at least too much as if there were one God diverse from the other; whereas one and the same Godhead is in all and each of the three, you may say it of each thrice over, the Father is God, the Son is God, &c. But that there are three Gods sounds harsh, and is condemned by Scripture language.⁷

He states there is a plethora of Scriptures that support the doctrine of the Trinity but he focusses on several passages in the Pentateuch since 'as [Moses] was the first penman of any Scripture, so he must needs have laid the foundation (though more darkly and obscurely) of such gospel truths.'⁸ Further, he notes that both Jesus and Paul appeal to Moses for evidence of the plurality of persons within the Godhead.

⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:349-403.

⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:350.

⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:350.

⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:353.

Along with his appeal to Moses, Goodwin also employs the Trinitarian formula, *opera ad extra Trinitatis indivisa sunt*.⁹ Referring to the use of the personal pronoun ‘us’ found in Genesis 1:26, 3:22, 11:7, and 19:24, Goodwin argues both that ‘“us” imports a plurality of persons to have been with God,’¹⁰ and ‘that God doth nothing without an *us*.’¹¹ This common working of the three persons is seen in the creation, governing, judging, and saving of the world.

C. The Three Persons are Distinct From Each Other

Goodwin goes on to insist that this ‘us’ of the Godhead is, nevertheless, persons distinct from one another. To support this, he offers six arguments,¹² the last of which is most relevant to this thesis since it also offers a reason for the incarnation. Goodwin believes the clearest demonstration of the distinctions among the persons of the Trinity is found in the union of the divine nature with human nature in the person of the incarnate Son, and further, that one of God’s main purposes in ordaining the union of the divine nature of the Son of God with a human nature was ‘to declare, to the end that men might “hear with their ears, and see with their eyes” (as John), the original distinction of the Father and his Son, as distinct persons in the deity.’¹³

Jesus Christ is God

Goodwin’s exposition of the divinity of the second person of the Trinity is entirely in harmony with the orthodoxy of the Reformed tradition. He states unequivocally that

Christ is God; not as appearing only in the form of God, as some of late, or by office only, but God by nature; the right God, the true God, the great God, the only God, the living God.¹⁴

⁹ Muller defines the term this way: ‘The *ad extra* (or external) works of the Trinity are undivided; specifically, since the Godhead is one in essence, one in knowledge, and one in will, it would be impossible in any work *ad extra* for one of the divine persons to will and to do one thing and another of the divine persons to will and do another. Muller, *Dictionary*, 246.

¹⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:352.

¹¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:356 (emphasis original).

¹² *Knowledge, Works* 4:359-361.

¹³ *Knowledge, Works* 4:442.

¹⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:431.

And if Jesus is the Son of God, ‘then necessarily, in point of rational inference, he must be God essentially. . . . If God begets a Son he must be God, the living true God.’¹⁵

Although God the Son is in essence God, it is the Father who is the ‘Father of the Deity . . . [the] *Fons Deitatis* . . . [who] communicated that Deity to the Son, and unto the Holy Ghost.’¹⁶ Goodwin is careful to qualify this. The first person of the Trinity did not ‘father’ in the sense of ‘create’ the divine nature of the Son. ‘No; the object of his fatherhood in that sense is only the person of Christ.’¹⁷ That is, the essence Christ receives is not a different essence than the Father has.¹⁸

In the eternal begetting the Son receives the

essential perfections of the Godhead . . . for the Father communicates all and the whole of himself unto the Son, giving him, by his eternal generation of him, the fullness of the Deity.¹⁹

The second person of the Trinity has

the whole Godhead communicated to him in the fullness of it, for *essentiae communicatio facit omnia communia*, the Godhead being communicated by the Father, all things of the Godhead, or that can be attributed thereunto, are communicated to all three, only the distinction of persons excepted.²⁰

The Essential Glory of Christ

Having demonstrated Goodwin’s Trinitarianism respecting the divinity of Christ, the essential glory of the second person of the Trinity should now be discussed. What is the glory that Christ as God, simply considered, has? The answer to this question can be found in Goodwin’s discussion of the glory of God.

¹⁵ *Knowledge*, Works 4:431.

¹⁶ *Ephesians*, Works 1:328.

¹⁷ *Ephesians*, Works 1:328.

¹⁸ Richard A. Muller, in connection with Calvin’s emphasis on the aseity of the Son, writes: ‘The Son’s aseity found in Calvin’s trinitarian polemic is not echoed by all the early orthodox Reformed theologians.’ *PPRD*, 4:326. One does not see any discussion of the Son’s aseity in Goodwin, per se, but he insists that the Son is ‘very God of very God.’ *Of Election*, Works 9:141.

¹⁹ *Of Election*, Works 9:139-140.

²⁰ *Of Election*, Works 9:140.

Essential Glory and the Glory of God

According to Goodwin, God's essential glory is also Christ's essential glory. In a sermon on Ephesians 1:6 ('to the praise of the glory of his grace') he speaks of God's double glory, the one essential, the other manifestative. God's essential glory is the glory of his attributes.²¹ His manifestative glory is the public display of this essential glory to the world.²² This essential glory belongs not just to God the Father, but to God the Son as well because they are one. This Goodwin makes clear when he has Christ saying to his Father,

[W]hatever essential glory or perfection, whatever blessedness, &c., is in thee is in me, for we are one and co-equal in respect of essence, and of all the same divine perfections of the Godhead; though as persons, and in our relation as such, we are distinct.²³

For Goodwin then the essential glory of Christ flows from his status in the Godhead. Whatever is in the Father is also in the Son. As a person of the Godhead, then, all the attributes of God, his essential glory, belong to Christ. It is the fullness of perfections that are infinitely present in the Godhead.

Summary of the Essential Glory of Christ

For Goodwin, in keeping with Nicene Christology, the second person of the Trinity is 'God of God, and very God.'²⁴ All the essential attributes of deity have been communicated to the eternally begotten Son by the Father, the *fons deitatis*. Furthermore, the Son, despite his becoming God-man and the Mediator of God's elect, loses none of his essential attributes though, being God, his essential glory is as invisible as God is.

Union and Communion among the Trinity

It is appropriate, while discussing the essential glory of the second person of the Godhead, to observe Goodwin's discussion of the union and communion the three persons have among themselves. This is true both because the three persons enjoy this union and communion essentially, and because the enjoyment of this essential union and communion

²¹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:105.

²² *Ephesians, Works* 1:105.

²³ *Of Election, Works* 9:140.

²⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:494.

gives rise to the necessity of the second person of the Godhead having additional glory, both personal and mediatorial.

This discussion of the *circumincession*, the mutual indwelling of each person in the others, is critical for what he will go on to say about the goal of the creation and redemption of humanity. Though the union and communion between the members of the Trinity is *sui generis*, the union and communion between the elect and their God is analogous to it. Employing Proverbs 8:30-31 Goodwin presents the Trinity as ‘three blessed companions of a knot and society among themselves, enjoying fellowship and delights accordingly in themselves’²⁵ and ‘they infinitely pleased themselves in the view and contemplation’²⁶ of believers’ union with them. That is, their mutual delight was not only to be the model of our union with them,²⁷ it also appears to be one motive for creating humanity.²⁸

Goodwin bases his discussion of this ‘supreme sovereign union’²⁹ between ‘God and Christ, and by consequence the Holy Ghost,’³⁰ on Christ’s prayer in John 17:21-23. He argues that these verses show that in eternity, before creation, the ‘three persons wholly enjoyed themselves all that time without interruption,’³¹ and that this union and communion ‘is of a higher kind than what we are ordained ever to receive.’³² Referring specifically to John 17:23, ‘I in them, and thou in me,’ Goodwin notes that even when Christians arrive at the highest perfection of union³³ Christ wants them to know that his

²⁵ *Of Election*, Works 9:145.

²⁶ *Of Election*, Works 9:146. Paul Blackham writes: ‘The idea of the three persons of the Trinity engrossed in one another’s company, but not to the exclusion of others, from everlasting to everlasting so grips Goodwin that he seems to abandon standard models of a division between God in Himself and God for us in favour of God-in-Himself-who-is-for-us.’ *Pneumatology*, 34.

²⁷ Goodwin writes that the intratrinitarian delight was ‘the exemplar of that to be had in time with us.’ *Of Election*, Works 9:146.

²⁸ Goodwin proposes there are other motives including the manifestation and declaration of God’s name (*Of Election*, Works 9:126) and the will of God, ‘the good pleasure of his will’ (*Ephesians*, Works 1:104). In a manner similar to Jonathan Edwards in ‘A Dissertation Concerning the End for Which God Created the World,’ Edwards, Works, vol. 1:94-121, Goodwin acknowledges that there are multiple motives for what God does although he can say, ‘He hath no final cause that ultimately moveth him, but his own glory and his Son’s.’ *Ephesians*, Works 1:147.

²⁹ *Knowledge*, Works 4:362.

³⁰ *Knowledge*, Works 4:362.

³¹ *Knowledge*, Works 4:363.

³² *Knowledge*, Works 4:362.

³³ It is important to note that Goodwin understands Christ’s prayer for believers’ unity in John 17:21, ‘That they may be one’, not, in the first place, as the union of believers with one another, but as the union of believers with God. He acknowledges that commentators generally limit it to the union which the catholic

union with the Father is superior to theirs with him and that their union with the Father depends on him. The Father and the Son's union is immediate while Christians' union with God is mediate, that is, Goodwin has Christ saying to his Father, 'I must come in as a middle between them and thee, when they are with us in glory.'³⁴ This is also why Christ does not pray for himself and the Father to be one, as he does for believers, for the Father and the Son 'were as fully one already as for ever they could be, to be sure as second person naturally, and as a man, it was so bestowed at once for ever, as it needed no praying for anew.'³⁵ The union and communion enjoyed among the persons of the Godhead is, to the degree that humans are capable of, to be enjoyed between humans and God.

The Union and Communion Defined

What is this union and communion among the persons of the Godhead? Goodwin lists seven distinctive characteristics of this fellowship.³⁶ It is a fellowship—

1. In that divine eternal life of the three persons among themselves.
2. In the mutual interest, or propriety, which they have in the things of each other.
3. In a mutual communication and enjoyment.
4. In a mutual knowledge and acquaintance with one another.
5. In a mutual communication, and imparting of secrets, a discovery of each other's mind.
6. In mutual love and delight.
7. In their possession of one common and equal glory and blessedness.

church has as members of the body of Christ, with Christ as the head. Although he does not discount the reality of that union, it is only an implication of the union of believers with God. He goes on to write, 'But sure this is too narrow a vessel to contain the big words by which Christ expresseth this union here to his Father; but it is directly and immediately intended of that grand union of all unions whatever, even of our union with God and Christ themselves.' *Of Election, Works* 9:108.

³⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:364.

³⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:364.

³⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:365.

At each point in his exposition of these seven characteristics Goodwin is careful to note both the uniqueness of that union and communion and the analogous nature of the believer's union with God.

At the end of this section Goodwin anticipates what he will later say about the union between the second person and human nature, as well as the union with God into which believers are brought at their regeneration, even if fully experienced only at the consummation of all things. He writes that it is for our comfort

to see how our union hath the union among the three persons for its foundation, and pattern, and original; and to hear the story how union is let down to the man Christ Jesus first, and in him conveyed to us; to know and behold the union of three persons in one divine nature, Father, Son, Holy Ghost, one God blessed for ever, producing, in imitation of them, an union of the two natures of God and man in the person of Christ Jesus; to whom be all glory for ever; and then, that occasioning a third union, yea, the next that could be, though more removed; an union of persons (though not personal), yea, of multitudes of persons united unto one Christ Jesus.³⁷

Goodwin presents here a schema of God's eternal existence and plan for his people. There is the union among the three persons in one nature. This is imitated in the union between God and man in the incarnation of the Son of God. That union, in turn, is paralleled in the union between God and human beings through their union with Christ.

Summary

We have noticed that Goodwin follows Nicaean orthodoxy regarding the deity of the second person of the Trinity. That Christ is in essence God and as God has a glory, though invisible, is crucial for his exposition of the other two glories of Christ. Although not front and centre in Goodwin's Christology, that Christ is essentially God, is foundational. Christ would have no personal or mediatorial glory were he not 'God of God, and very God.'

But the place of the second person in the Godhead is also essential for Goodwin's exposition of God's intentions for his chosen people, both as fallen and as unfallen. The mutual union and communion among the persons of the Trinity becomes a motive for the Godhead's decretal design with regard to the elect. The Trinity's mutual joy moves all

³⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:371-2.

three Persons to share that joy with the elect of God who are chosen for union and communion with the Trinity through the God-man, Jesus Christ.

The next chapter will explore both the relation Christ's mediatorial work and glory has to his essential glory and the role Christ the Mediator plays in the Godhead's desire for union and communion with believers.

Chapter 2: The Mediatorial Glory of the God-man

Goodwin's key statement regarding the glory of Christ bears repeating.

And indeed Christ hath a threefold glory. The first essential, the same with God his Father. . . . The second, belonging to his person, as now constituted God-man. . . . Thirdly, The glory of his mediatorship acquired by himself.¹

Although he distinguishes Christ's glory in these three ways he does not give equal weight to all three. In fact, as will appear later, the centre of Goodwin's Christology is the person of the Lord Jesus Christ as the God-man, and therefore the chief glory of Christ is his personal glory.

One might think, then, that the way into his understanding of the God-man is to start with a discussion of his personal glory. That, however, is not Goodwin's own recommendation. He states that although it is true that a view of the personal excellencies of the person of Christ would entice someone to become a Christian, a sinner's first introduction is to the God-man as Saviour.²

Further, Goodwin argues that it is the mediatorial work of Christ of which the Scriptures most speak

because our being miserable and sinful is that which is our present and immediate concern, which we are most solicitous about in this world, whilst we are sinners; yea, and continues our concern until we, by that final sentence and judgment passed at latter day, have them for ever declared and published to be forgiven.³

We see here hints to where his Christology will lead us. But first we must follow his map and focus our attention on the mediatorial work of Christ and the glory that will accrue to him because of it.

When Goodwin begins discussing Christ the Mediator he makes clear that Christ is the Mediator of man considered as fallen. This is important to remember because of the

¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:494.

² *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:17.

³ *Of Election, Works* 9:98.

secondary place the glory Christ receives from his mediatorial work in relation to his essential and personal glory.

Why the Incarnation?

Goodwin argues that God's intention that Christ 'assume man's nature was not simply or only founded upon the supposition or the foresight of the Fall, as if occasioned only thereupon.'⁴ This particular aspect of Goodwin's view was by no means unique or novel. Throughout Church history many interacted with the question, If Adam had not sinned, would the Son of God have come in the flesh? Though a hypothetical question, one's answer to it reveals one's understanding of the incarnation. Augustine, in a gloss on 1 Timothy 1:15 and Luke 19:10 writes: 'If man had not got lost, the Son of man would not have come.'⁵ Aquinas repeats Augustine's comments and also gives a harmatiocentric answer to the question. Noting that the power of God is such that he could have become incarnate even if sin had not existed, he highlights human sin as the reason for the incarnation.⁶

The Thomistic view was challenged by the Franciscan thesis that stated the Incarnation was not predicated on the presence of sin. The chief spokesperson for this view was John Duns Scotus (1266-1308):

I declare, however, that the fall was not the cause of Christ's predestination. In fact, even if no man or angel had fallen, nor any man but Christ were to be created, Christ would still have been predestined this way.⁷

Goodwin was familiar with medieval scholastics and, in particular, John Duns Scotus, even calling him 'the wisest of [the schoolmen].'⁸ But although Goodwin does not follow the Thomists in predicating the fall on human sin, neither is he willing, as the Scotists are, to say that Christ would have become incarnate if humanity had never fallen.

⁴ *Ephesians*, Works 1:99.

⁵ Augustine, *The Works*, 258.

⁶ Aquinas, *The Summa*, III.1.3.

⁷ John Duns Scotus, *Opus Parisiense*, Lib III, d.7, q.4 (ed. Balić) 13-15 cited in Dean, *A Primer*, 16.

⁸ *Ephesians*, Works 2:272.

He considers that question ‘as great a chimera and fiction as many of those school questions and disputes.’⁹ But Goodwin will affirm

that God, in ordaining Christ, the second Person, to assume a human nature, had not Christ in his eye only or chiefly as a redeemer, but withal looked upon that infinite glory of the second Person to be manifested in that nature through this assumption. Both those ends moved him; and of the two, the glory of Christ’s person, in and through that union, had the greatest sway.¹⁰

So, although not his ultimate focus, the redemption of humanity was one of the ends God had in mind in ordaining Christ to be the God-man.

The Pactum Salutis

These considerations lead us to consider Goodwin’s emphasis that Christ’s mediatorial work has its source in eternity, more specifically in the eternal *pactum salutis*. Mark Jones writes that

[t]he *pactum salutis* is a pretemporal, intratrinitarian covenant between the Father, Son and Spirit that provides the eternal, inviolable foundation of the temporal covenant of grace (*foedus gratiae*) . . . the *pactum salutis* is indeed the key to understanding Thomas Goodwin’s Christology.¹¹

To say that the *pactum salutis* is the key to understanding Goodwin’s Christology may not be entirely accurate.¹² Nevertheless, the covenant of redemption does play a foundational role in Goodwin’s discussion of the work of Christ as the Saviour of sinners.

As he often does, Goodwin imagines a conversation among the persons of the Trinity, in this case regarding the salvation of humanity.¹³ He writes:

⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:99. It is worth noting, however, Goodwin states elsewhere that had humanity not fallen Christ still would have had a human nature, though his humanity would not have involved taking frail flesh and coming in the form of a servant. Goodwin says that in God’s ‘primary intention, his chief and primary decree, his eye and first aim was at his Son’s having such a state and condition in his human nature as he hath now in heaven glorified.’ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:74. We will have occasion to return to this later.

¹⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:99-100.

¹¹ Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 145. Jonathan Mark Carter concurs: ‘This argument is well-founded, echoing Goodwin’s logic in *Christ the Mediator*.’ *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 18.

¹² Jones himself later acknowledges that Goodwin’s focus on Christ’s personal glory, abstracted from his work of redemption, should have been pressed more in his dissertation. Beeke and Jones, *A Puritan Theology*, 154, fn 35.

¹³ Paul Blackham writes that ‘Goodwin barely acknowledges a distinction between the Trinity in salvation history and the Trinity in itself’ which leads him to say ‘[t]his enables Goodwin to take intra-Trinitarian

I will choose him to life, saith the Father, but he will fall, and so fall short of what my love designed to him; but I will redeem him, says the Son, out of that lost estate. But yet being fallen he will refuse that grace, and the offers of it, and despise it; therefore I will sanctify him, said the Holy Ghost, and overcome his unrighteousness, and cause him to accept it.¹⁴

The above quotation reveals that in the redemption of man the glory of each particular person of the Trinity is manifest because each person has a distinct and traceable part to play in the common work of salvation. Although all works *ad extra* are the work of all the persons of the Trinity, it is in the redemption of humanity that the *vestigia trinitatis*, the footsteps of the Trinity, are seen, distinctly, so that we can track the operation of each person, namely, election by the Father, redemption by the Son, and the application of redemption attributed more eminently to the Spirit.¹⁵

The *pactum salutis*, however, says more than that each person plays a distinct role. It teaches that each person covenanted to play that role.¹⁶ In Goodwin's thinking, in the eternal fellowship of the Trinity, having decided to redeem the fallen elect, the Father assigned the Son to purchase salvation for them, which assignment the Son accepted, and then the Spirit was made responsible for applying election and the purchased redemption to the elect, an obligation he was pleased to shoulder.

Goodwin's specific treatment of the *pactum salutis* is at the beginning of his work, *Of Christ the Mediator*.¹⁷

Although mankind was created in a state of 'amity and friendship with God,'¹⁸ by their fall that friendship has been broken, thus requiring reconciliation if there is to be future fellowship. God, who is rich in mercy, determined that some of those rebels should

conversations quite seriously as genuine reportage of what the members of the Trinity have said to one another.' *Pneumatology*, 28. He later states that Goodwin 'seems to abandon standard models of a division between God in Himself and God for us in favour of God-in-Himself-who-is-for-us.' *Pneumatology*, 34.

¹⁴ *Man's Restoration, Works* 7:540.

¹⁵ *Man's Restoration, Works* 7:533.

¹⁶ It is interesting to note that the Savoy Declaration of 1658, a confession that arose out of a conference of Congregational Churches in England that met at Savoy Palace convened by Oliver Cromwell at John Owen and Goodwin's request, and which adopted the bulk of the Westminster Confession of Faith, inserted the words 'according to a covenant made between them both' in 8:1 in speaking of God's choice of Christ to be the Mediator between God and man.

¹⁷ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:1-436.

¹⁸ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:3.

be restored to peace with him and has therefore sent his ambassadors throughout all ages with the message of reconciliation.¹⁹ This ambassadorial message not only declares God's goodwill towards these rebels, but also that he does not first require them to make satisfaction to his justice since he has already done that in the person of his Son Jesus Christ.²⁰

All the persons of the Trinity are offended by humanity's rebellion but it is chiefly to the Father that reconciliation is made.²¹ Since he represents the whole Trinity in this suit,²² the covenant of works, which sinners have broken, was chiefly made with him as the Creator,²³ and, 'because the other two persons of the Trinity have other distinct offices in the work of reconciliation.'²⁴

As the Father is the primary one to whom reconciliation is made, Goodwin has the Father as the chief architect of reconciliation. 'He it is that draws the platform of all the works that the other two persons do put their hand to effect.'²⁵ The initiating and completion of reconciliation is attributed to his will. Furthermore, although accomplished by Christ as Mediator, it is God the Father who reconciles us to himself because Christ does his work by the Father's appointment and thus the glory given to Christ for his work is ultimately for the glory of the Father.

The Father was not obligated to make reconciliation with sinners but chose to redeem his people because he is love and mercy is his delight.²⁶

But how should he reconcile them? Goodwin argues that God could have pardoned rebels without requiring the satisfaction of his justice, and therefore that the atonement was

¹⁹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:4.

²⁰ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:4.

²¹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:7.

²² *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:7-8.

²³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:7.

²⁴ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:8.

²⁵ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:9.

²⁶ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:13-14.

not necessary.²⁷ He writes: ‘he might have saved you without Christ’s satisfaction, that is certain.’²⁸ He bases this on a number of considerations.

First, ‘to hate sin indeed is an act of his nature, but to express his hatred by punishing is an act of his will, and therefore might be wholly suspended.’²⁹ Since he does not immediately punish for sin, which he would if it were an act of his nature, why might he not forbear punishing permanently ‘and so wholly pardon?’³⁰

Secondly, Goodwin gathers from Christ’s request of his Father in the Garden of Gethsemane for the cup to pass from him, since, ‘All things are possible to thee,’ that it was possible for God to save apart from the mediatorial work of Christ.³¹

Why then did Christ die? For a variety of reasons because God has a variety of purposes. To express his love is a significant one for, as he writes, to pardon without satisfaction ‘would not manifest such depths of love.’³² ‘If justice might have permitted it and let that dismal cup pass and slip, yet love was engaged and resolved to manifest itself this way rather.’³³ Also, along with mercy, justice is an attribute of his nature and since his nature is pure act, it ‘provokes all his will to manifest these his attributes upon all occasions’³⁴ and his ‘plot of reconciliation [is] his masterpiece, wherein he means to bring all his attributes upon the stage.’³⁵

And since humanity was unable to make a full and complete satisfaction to the justice of God, God in his wisdom thought of a single person, as a ‘commutation, so as that

²⁷ John Owen interacts with similar views to Goodwin’s and comments that these views ‘are very great absurdities . . . [and] it would have seemed strange to me that any men of judgment and orthodoxy should have been so entangled in some of these sophisms as to renounce the truth of their account, unless I had happened at one time myself to fall into the same snare.’ *Divine Justice, Works*, vol. 10:508.

²⁸ *Ephesians, Works* 1:126.

²⁹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:72.

³⁰ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:72.

³¹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:72.

³² *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:15.

³³ *Man’s Restoration, Works* 7:195.

³⁴ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:16.

³⁵ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:16.

that satisfaction should be performed by a surety in our stead.³⁶ This single person was Christ.

Christ Appointed Mediator

Christ was appointed to the office of mediator. The Father dedicates his own Son to be the mediator, appointing him to be the priest,³⁷ and Christ readily accepts the appointment.³⁸ Goodwin notes the unity of the will of the Father and the Son and yet wishes to highlight that Christ went to the cross not simply as an act of his will, but ‘out of love to us, yet chiefly for his Father’s entreaty and command, and out of love to him.’³⁹

Along with the appointment to the work, the Father also gave him the people for whom he should do his work. The elect, who were chosen by the Father, are given to Christ from all eternity as a gift in order that he might accomplish their salvation by his priestly sacrifice.

In addition to Christ’s promise to the Father to be the surety for sinners and in return for his willingness, Goodwin notes, the Father makes a promise to Christ, ‘to justify, adopt and forgive, sanctify and glorify those he gives him . . . so his labour should not be in vain.’⁴⁰

Goodwin concludes his discussion of the *pactum salutis* by stating that ‘[t]here was never so much joy in heaven as upon this happy conclusion and agreement’ which answers in part that ‘curious question . . . what God did before the world was made.’⁴¹

³⁶ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:17.

³⁷ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:23.

³⁸ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:24.

³⁹ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:25.

⁴⁰ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:27.

⁴¹ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:31-32. This response is more satisfactory than Augustine’s. He engages with the question and considers the response, ‘He was preparing Hell for people who pry into mysteries’ a ‘frivolous retort.’ He would rather plead ignorance than make ‘a laughing-stock of a man who asks a serious question.’ He then posits that if there were time before creation than God was making time and if there was no time before the creation it is a moot question because ‘If there was no time, there was no “then.”’ *Confessions*, Book 11, Chapters 12-13.

Why the God-man?

The *pactum salutis* was an agreement among the three persons of the Trinity for man's redemption. But why was it necessary for the mediator of God's elect to be a person of the Trinity and both God and man? Goodwin answers this from a number of angles.

Why God?

Since the office of the Old Testament priest is seen to be honourable (Hebrews 5:4-5), the priesthood of Christ must be transcendently glorious, a glory that is too great for a mere creature. Since God refuses to share his glory with anyone else the priest appointed to such a high office must also be God.⁴²

Goodwin then returns to the *pactum salutis*. Since the covenant of redemption is a covenant forged in eternity, the one who was going to be party to that covenant must be eternal too in order to be present when it was struck and thus to be aware of and give assent to all the conditions and obligations and rewards of that covenant.⁴³

Considering the conditions of the covenant Goodwin argues that the mediator must be God. The blessings promised are so great the Father would not risk premising them upon a mere creature because failure would have such enormous ramifications. Nor would humans be eager to put faith in a mere creature, much less fulfil the obligation of obedience and perpetual service to the one who reconciled us if he were not God himself. '[T]herefore it was fit that none but God himself should save and buy us out.'⁴⁴

Finally, we want a Saviour who knows our hearts in order to help us in our times of need and upon whom we could rest in confidence. Only if our Saviour is God could we be confident that our salvation is secure.

Thus, having contended that the mediator must be God, Goodwin then proposes that of the three persons of the Godhead, the second one was most suited for that office.⁴⁵

⁴² *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:36.

⁴³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:138.

⁴⁴ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:40.

⁴⁵ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:41-44.

The God-man

While essential that the mediator be divine, Goodwin argues that it would be inappropriate for the mediator to assume an angelic nature.⁴⁶ Instead he gives three reasons why it was necessary for the mediator to be human.⁴⁷

The mediator should possess the natures of the reconciled and the one to whom reconciliation is made and thereby be a middle person between them. It is only the God-man who can bridge the distance between God and man and by his work bring the two parties together. As God, he is able to bestow the purchased blessings on his people; as man, he is able to perform what was necessary for humanity's redemption.

Christ the Mediator

The mediator appointed in eternity was the second person of the Trinity become man. Goodwin develops this further in his discussion of satisfaction. It is against this backdrop that Goodwin's understanding of the work of Christ the Mediator is to be understood and, more particularly, how Christ's satisfaction connects with this mediatorial glory of the second person of the Trinity.

Satisfaction for What?

Goodwin argues that as sin is an expression of enmity towards both God and his law satisfaction must be made to both God and the law. Here, however, 'both come to one; for satisfy the law, and you satisfy God, and so *e contra*.'⁴⁸ Goodwin finds it helpful to distinguish them so that an accurate understanding of satisfaction can be achieved.

Humanity owes a 'double debt'⁴⁹ to God's law because the law requires both precise obedience and also punishment in the event of disobedience. Humans owe God obedience because we are his creatures and he is our sovereign, and we are liable to punishment because we are sinners and he is our judge.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:45-48.

⁴⁷ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:44-45.

⁴⁸ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:84.

⁴⁹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:85.

⁵⁰ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:85.

After arguing that no mere creature, even one who shared in all of Christ's attributes except the hypostatic union,⁵¹ could satisfy the demands of God's law, Goodwin proceeds to discuss what is for him central in satisfaction, namely, that it is required to be made to God, and, more particularly, to the honour God lost by human sin.⁵²

Goodwin's definition of satisfaction is worth quoting in full.

Satisfaction in general is, when so much clear emolument ariseth to the party wronged, as was impaired by the trespass committed. Now all such damages to be repaired do usually consist either in goods or honour; and satisfaction for goods is usually called restitution, but satisfaction for honour is it which is more properly called satisfaction.⁵³

Wrong has been done to God in terms of his goods by human sin. Sin would have destroyed this world, blotted grace out of the human heart. It destroyed God's law. By not doing what the law required, humans robbed God of the service he deserved.⁵⁴

Goodwin, however, says that God does not expect restitution of these goods, nor would humanity be capable of compensation in this matter if he did. On the contrary, it is the compensation to his honour that he both expects and which a creature is capable of giving him. This assertion lays the foundation for the uniqueness of Christ as the Mediator and for elucidating how the personal and mediatorial glories of Christ interact with each other.

God has created all things for his own glory. This glory does not refer to his essential glory which is unaffected by both human action and inaction. This glory is God's

⁵¹ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:81.

⁵² Goodwin does not reference Anselm in this connection, but the early part of his discussion (Books 1-3) in *Christ the Mediator* certainly follows the contours of Anselm's dissertation, *Why God Became Man*. For example, Anselm writes, 'Thus [for a creature] to sin is the same thing as not to render his due to God. . . One who does not render this honor to God takes away from God what belongs to him, and dishonors God, and to do this is to sin.' *Why God Became Man*, 119. Goodwin moves beyond Anselm's *Why God Became Man* in Books 5 and 6 of his treatise where he speaks about Christ's actual performance of our redemption as he is made sin and a curse and experiences the wrath of his Father.

⁵³ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:91.

⁵⁴ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:92. Anselm makes a similar point: 'Did he not take away from God whatever he had planned to make out of human nature?' *Why God Became Man*, 141.

‘manifestative’ glory, which is the demonstration ‘of God himself, in his perfections towards us,’⁵⁵ which a creature can both add to and take from.

Since sin is an evil *against* God and a great dishonour *to* God, no mere creature can make the necessary satisfaction for it. Goodwin marshals many considerations to demonstrate this.⁵⁶ The one that is most germane for our purposes is the first one he proffers: Satisfaction as a restoration of honour can only be accomplished by someone of equal honour. Since it is the restoration of personal honour its value depends on the personal worth of the one who makes satisfaction.⁵⁷ Creatures, however, are not of equal honour to God.

Christ Makes Satisfaction

Having expounded the inability of humanity, even aided by grace, to satisfy God for the dishonour his manifestative glory suffered by their sin, Goodwin is now prepared to develop how Christ makes full reparation to God for the loss occasioned by sin. Once again he employs the distinction between the loss of goods God experienced and the loss and debasing of his honour. Although the loss of goods is not God’s concern in satisfaction, Goodwin shows that if it were, Christ has more than compensated and this compensation can be seen as over and above the satisfaction God requires.⁵⁸

Compensation for Loss of Honour

In introducing the satisfaction accomplished by Christ Goodwin writes:

But the greatest evil of sin lies in the injury by it done unto the honour, and sovereign glory, and to the person of God himself, which is the thing that makes sin so heinous, that the difficulty of satisfying God herein is insuperable by all the creatures (as has been shewed), unto which, notwithstanding, we shall see Christ is as much enabled, as we have seen him to be unto the former [meaning, the loss of goods], to make amends for the damage which God sustained.⁵⁹

Understanding Goodwin’s Christology forces us to reckon with both the person and work of Christ. This is particularly important in discussing how Christ makes satisfaction

⁵⁵ *Of Election*, Works 9:126.

⁵⁶ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:93-100.

⁵⁷ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:95-96.

⁵⁸ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:101-103.

⁵⁹ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:103.

for the loss of honour God sustained by sin. One of the issues that made satisfaction impossible by mere creatures is that they are not ‘equally worthy and honourable’⁶⁰ as God. But that is not the situation with Christ, since he is the God-man. Therefore Goodwin’s treatment of Christ’s satisfaction begins with the person of Christ before moving to a discussion of what Christ has done. Along the way one can see how Christ compensates the Father for the loss of manifestative glory suffered by sin.

Goodwin anchors his discussion of Christ’s satisfaction in Paul’s words in Philippians,

Who, being the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.⁶¹

How does Goodwin explain the theology behind his view of both Christ’s person and work in light of the satisfaction he made?

Since the worth of the satisfaction depends on the worth of the person, Christ’s work is of infinite value because he is an infinite person. Goodwin does not move directly from the Son of God as he is the second person of the Trinity to his work as Mediator. Rather, he speaks of the fullness of the Godhead being personally communicated to the man Jesus and then this God-man, in his personal glory, accomplishing the work of satisfaction.

This two-step process is important for Goodwin because the dishonouring of glory necessary to repay God for loss of glory could not refer to Christ’s essential glory because ‘this glory of his, as he is merely God, cannot be debased or diminished, and so can never properly become the matter of satisfaction for sin.’⁶² His essential glory is ‘the foundation and groundwork’⁶³ of his personal glory as the God-man and precisely because it ensures that his work in our human nature has an infinite worth. Thus, Goodwin employs the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum*⁶⁴ and makes Christ’s satisfaction the satisfaction

⁶⁰ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:95.

⁶¹ Phil 2:6-8.

⁶² *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:104.

⁶³ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:104.

⁶⁴ Calvin’s statements in the *Institutes* are helpful here. Regarding the hypostatic union Calvin, in keeping with the Chalcedonian Definition, writes that the incarnation ‘means that, because he chose for himself the virgin’s womb as a temple in which to dwell, he who was the Son of God became the Son of Man—not by confusion of substance but by unity of person. For we affirm his divinity so joined and united with

to God *by* God in our flesh and therefore apposite to human reconciliation. As Goodwin writes, '[a]nd surely this will equal the proportion of evil that is in our sins; for as the offence was against an infinitely glorious God, so the works done to take away the offence were wrought by one as infinite.'⁶⁵

Goodwin is careful to adhere to the Reformed teaching *finitum non capax infiniti*.⁶⁶ Though the works of the human nature are performed by the mighty God and the blood of Jesus is the blood of God (Acts 20:28) this is not to say that the actions of the God-man are as infinite as the actor himself is, 'essentially and substantially; for Christ's merits could not be infinite, as God's attributes are; but it is enough to satisfaction, that they might be valued such in a moral estimation.'⁶⁷ Just as sin is considered infinite because it is against an infinite God, so the satisfaction of Christ is considered infinite because it is rendered by an infinite person.

Goodwin then proceeds to distinguish further between the essential glory of Christ and his personal or manifestative glory. Since it was not God's essential glory, but his manifestative glory that was diminished by human sin, it is not the essential glory of the Son of God that is offered to God. Further, satisfaction requires a 'lessening of glory in the satisfier, to give glory to him that is to have satisfaction'⁶⁸ and essential glory cannot be diminished or increased. Therefore, Goodwin argues, the second person needed a glory that could be obscured in addition to his essential glory.

Goodwin agrees that the manifestative glory of all three persons of the Godhead is seen in creation and other divine works. But it cannot be this manifestative glory that makes satisfaction, for if it is obscured in the Son it is equally obscured in the other two

his humanity that each retains its distinctive nature unimpaired, and yet these two natures constitute one Christ.' And, '[t]hus, also, the Scriptures speak of Christ: they sometimes attribute to him what must be referred solely to his humanity, sometimes what belongs uniquely to his divinity; and sometimes what embraces both natures but fits neither alone. And they so earnestly express this union of two natures that is in Christ as sometimes to interchange them. This figure of speech is called by the ancient writers "the communicating of properties." ' *Institutes*, 2.14.1.

⁶⁵ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:105.

⁶⁶ 'The finite is incapable of the infinite; i.e., the finite or finite being is incapable of grasping, comprehending, or receiving the infinite or infinite being; an epistemological and ontological maxim drawn into Christological debate between the Reformed and the Lutherans.' Muller, *Dictionary*, 124.

⁶⁷ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:105.

⁶⁸ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:106.

persons of the Trinity. In order for Christ to exercise the office of Redeemer, then, three components are necessary to make Christ's satisfaction actually satisfactory.

1. He must have an essential glory as God to give worth to his work.
2. He must additionally have a manifestative glory that is creaturely and unique to him and personal.
3. He must undergo an obscuring of his glory that is also an obscuring of his person.⁶⁹

This is what Goodwin sees in Philippians 2:6-8. He sees Paul's statement that Christ was in the 'form of God' as a reference, not to his essential glory as God, but to his manifestative glory as the God-man. It means,

that God-like glory, and that manifestation of the Godhead, which was, and must needs be due to appear in the nature assumed; for *form* is put for an outward appearance and manifestation, in respect of which Christ, as God-man, is called "the brightness of his Father's glory," Heb. i.2.⁷⁰

So Christ, in his human nature, has a glory in addition to his essential glory and

manifests more of the essential glory of the Godhead, than God manifested in all his other works. . . . And in this respect Christ God-man may be said in a safe sense to be 'equal with God,' as here in the text [Phil 2.6], not in essence, but in a communication of privileges.⁷¹

Christ the God-man is both equal to God and 'in some way subject to God, and less than God *ratione officii*; as he says, "My Father is greater than I," John xiv.28.'⁷² Nevertheless, the Son of God dwelling in a human nature is due all the glory and honour of God. God will not give his glory to another (Isaiah 42:8) '[b]ut Christ God-man dares challenge such a glory, . . . as his due, and it is not robbery for him to do it, because it is his right.'⁷³

⁶⁹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:106.

⁷⁰ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:107.

⁷¹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:107.

⁷² *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:45.

⁷³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:108. This statement is in reference to the translation of the AV which states that Christ the God-man 'thought it not robbery to be equal with God,' that is, he did not think it improper to be considered equal with God because he was truly God.

Since, in Goodwin's estimation, satisfaction is 'a return of as much glory as was lost,'⁷⁴ and since Christ, in assuming a human nature⁷⁵ has both 'lessened' himself and brought glory by revealing the glory of the Godhead in the highest possible way,⁷⁶ Goodwin raises the question whether the mere act of the hypostatic union might be sufficient to make amends for the glory lost because of human sin.

Goodwin's negative response takes us into the heart of his Christology. He argues that Scripture does not indicate that God accepts it for satisfaction. Therefore 'what God reckons not satisfaction to him, we must not account such.'⁷⁷ Further, the reason God does not accept it as satisfaction is

because the sole end of Christ's assuming our nature, *quoad substantiam mysterii*, for the substance of this mystery, was not . . . the redemption of man; but there were other ends, which taken all together are as great as this, if not greater; as, the manifestation of God to the utmost.⁷⁸

The assumption of human nature is foundational to satisfaction but as such it is not a part of satisfaction because it is the act of the second person as second person and satisfaction must be made by the God-man. The God-man, because of the hypostatic union, was deserving of all glory and it is in this capacity that his glory must be obscured to make amends to God for glory lost by the sins of men.

So Goodwin sees the second person dwelling in a human nature bringing satisfaction to God by, in that nature, 'taking the form of a servant, humbling himself, being emptied, or of no reputation, and becoming obedient in his life, and this to the death of the cross, as being the last part of this payment.'⁷⁹

⁷⁴ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:109.

⁷⁵ It is important to understand Goodwin's construction of Christ's assumption of a human nature in two stages, what he calls elected and united. See *Knowledge*, Works 4:488-493. This will be discussed further when Goodwin's understanding of Christ's personal glory is delineated in chapter 3 of this thesis. For now it is sufficient to say that Goodwin holds that the second person is to be *considered* God-man from the moment of God's predestination of the second person as God-man and the Son's acceptance of that appointment, and that at that moment the Father bestows on him a personal glory in addition to his essential glory as God.

⁷⁶ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:109. This will be further discussed in the chapter on Christ's personal glory.

⁷⁷ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:110.

⁷⁸ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:110.

⁷⁹ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:111.

Christ must be found in the ‘same frail condition of passible nature that sinful man are found in’ and seek not his own glory due to him as the God-man but be willing to have it obscured and veiled; indeed, ‘robbed and spoiled of all manifestative glory whatsoever was due unto him’ by the worst debasement possible, ‘even the death of the cross’ and willingly, that is, Christ must ‘humble himself’ . . . ‘and all this to the glory of God the Father.’⁸⁰

Having thus retraced the condescension of the second person of the Trinity to be our mediator, from God as God, to God-man, to God-man humiliated to the form of a servant, or, from essential glory as God to the personal or manifestative glory as the God-man to the God-man robbed of his manifestative glory for the glory of his Father, Goodwin concludes:

I appeal even to the justice that is in all men’s hearts, if it doth not both equalise the dishonour done to God by sin, and also bring in a greater overplus of glory than was taken from God by it, and so make a full amends.⁸¹

Christ’s Mediatorial Glory

Here we might anticipate that Goodwin would go on to speak of the glory Christ receives from his work of redemption. He does mention it⁸² but it is not a point he labours, in part because of his understanding of Christ’s satisfaction. In his discussion of the mediatorial work of Christ the glory of reconciliation terminates on the first person of the Trinity. It is the Father’s manifestative glory that was lost by sin and restored by Christ in the lessening and debasing of his own personal and manifestative glory. All that Christ has done as Mediator was ‘to the glory of the Father.’⁸³ Christ’s glory consequent on his making satisfaction is not, for Goodwin, a central element of the discussion.

But does Christ receive any glory from his work of redemption? If one speaks of a change to Christ’s essential glory, then the answer must be in the negative. For that can neither be diminished nor increased. If one refers to his personal glory as the God-man, again, the answer is negative. ‘He hath not increased his personal glory by his own

⁸⁰ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:111.

⁸¹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:112.

⁸² *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:10.

⁸³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:11.

merits.’⁸⁴ However, ‘there is a glory [which] shines out of his works of mediation, and a glory of his offices, which is additional to his personal glory due unto his person.’⁸⁵ That is, although all was done to the glory of God the Father, ‘Christ hath a name above every name which we are to magnify and adore.’⁸⁶ In fact, Goodwin writes, ‘the work of redemption itself was ordained principally for Christ’s glory, more than for our salvation’, and ‘[t]he plot of redemption therefore was subjected to the glory of Christ, and not Christ to it.’⁸⁷

We can elucidate this point by looking at Goodwin’s discussion of the God-man’s twofold glory with reference to John 17:1 and 5. John 17:5, ‘And now, O Father, glorify me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was,’ is a reference, Goodwin argues, to a restoration, upon his return to heaven, of the personal glory bequeathed to Christ by God’s decree appointing him to be God-man. It follows, but is not on account of, the completion of his work of redemption. This glory was suspended during his humiliation for sinners and their salvation. In distinction, however, in John 17:1 Christ asks to be glorified on the basis of the work he will do on earth such as giving eternal life to all the Father had given him, (to which he refers in John 17:2). There is here, Goodwin states, a ‘twofold glorifying,’⁸⁸ a mediatorial glory ‘arising from his works of mediation’⁸⁹ and a personal glory which ‘simply arose from union and communion which he had, and was to have entirely with his Father, singly and alone.’⁹⁰

What glory accrues to Christ as the Mediator? Christ as Mediator is deserving of glory because he alone is able to be the mediator between God and man. Commenting on Revelation 5, Goodwin argues that if Christ receives glory for opening the scroll, he receives far more glory for his work of redemption which the elders intimate is the basis for his worthiness to open the scroll.⁹¹ Goodwin observes ‘that Christ, though he were

⁸⁴ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:126.

⁸⁵ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:126.

⁸⁶ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:11.

⁸⁷ *Ephesians*, Works 1:100.

⁸⁸ *Knowledge*, Works 4:495.

⁸⁹ *Knowledge*, Works 4:497.

⁹⁰ *Knowledge*, Works 4:495.

⁹¹ *Revelation*, Works 3:77.

worthy by inheritance, yet he is worthy by purchase also; so the words “that was slain” (Rev 5:12) do imply.’⁹²

Another aspect of Christ’s work of redemption that highlights his glory is his victory over Satan. Goodwin speaks first of ‘Christ’s meritorious victory’⁹³ which refers to the rout of Satan in the death of the cross. Satan has power over the elect because God’s curse set Satan over them as their punishment for refusing to have God rule over them.⁹⁴ In dealing with human sin so decisively by his death on the cross, Christ gains victory over Satan.

But it was not only human salvation that drew Christ into battle. A personal dimension is also involved, because in his rebellion Satan set up a kingdom to oppose the kingdom that Christ was appointed to rule as the God-man. ‘He must destroy therefore this his opposite, to make way for the possession of this his own kingdom.’⁹⁵ And so Christ defeated Satan by the cross, both for himself and for his people.

Not only is Christ’s conquest seen in the cross, it is also displayed publicly before all the hosts of heaven and hell. This public display, Goodwin argues, took place at Christ’s ascension. ‘The first conquest [at the cross] was over Satan’s works, weapons, power. . . . The other [at his ascension] was over his person, as an evidence God had given all his weapons and powers into his hands.’⁹⁶ Christ also triumphs over Satan, plundering his kingdom in his people by converting them. Further, Christ enables his people to be more than conquerors over Satan thus further enhancing Christ’s victory. Finally, the God-man’s victory over his enemy will be manifested both before the day of judgment, near the conclusion of human history, when Satan’s power will be severely curtailed when ‘a strict restraint shall be clapped on him’⁹⁷ and also at the day of judgment in the ‘final proceedings of Christ against him,’ when he brings ‘him and his angels into personal and open judgement before God, angels, and men.’⁹⁸ Goodwin concludes that there is glory for

⁹² *Revelation, Works* 3:15.

⁹³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:296.

⁹⁴ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:298-299.

⁹⁵ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:300.

⁹⁶ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:307.

⁹⁷ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:332.

⁹⁸ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:333.

Christ in each stage of his victory ‘but more in the whole of them all laid together; a stupendously excelling glory.’⁹⁹

But Christ the Mediator’s acquisition of glory did not end at his ascension to heaven. Even there glory accrues to him for his work for our salvation has two aspects to it according to Goodwin. The first is his once-and-for-all dying on the cross which is the ‘beginning of our faith;’ the second is his ongoing intercession at God’s right hand for the ‘finishing of our faith.’¹⁰⁰

Goodwin elaborates on this by discussing Christ’s Old Testament type, the Levitical high priest. Noting that the high priest’s office had two parts, first, offering sacrifice for the sins of the people, and second, presenting that sacrifice in the Most Holy Place by sprinkling the blood of the offering before the Ark of the Covenant,¹⁰¹ Goodwin argues, that correspondingly, Christ has a twofold ministry for our salvation, the offering of the sacrifice done on earth, the presentation of it done in heaven.

The reason both aspects of Christ’s work are necessary is not because his sacrifice lacks perfection. ‘[H]is death was a perfect oblation; it was perfect for an oblation; to which as such nothing can be added.’¹⁰² Rather, it was because

by God’s ordination there remained another further action of another kind that was to be added to this of oblation, and that is, intercession, or praying for us in heaven; otherwise our salvation by his death were not perfected.¹⁰³

But why was Christ’s presentation of that sacrifice in heaven so necessary? Goodwin gives three reasons.

First, it was to maximise God’s glory primarily by highlighting two of God’s attributes, ‘namely, justice and free grace.’¹⁰⁴ Christ satisfies God’s justice by his death on the cross, but he glorifies God’s grace by his intercession in heaven. Goodwin is so eager to stress the freeness of God’s grace that he writes: ‘God justifies and saves us through free

⁹⁹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:297.

¹⁰⁰ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:67.

¹⁰¹ Lev 16:14-15.

¹⁰² *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:60.

¹⁰³ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:60.

¹⁰⁴ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:61.

grace, so absolutely freely, as if his justice had had no satisfaction.’¹⁰⁵ Here he is seeking to avoid the notion that our justification is an economic transaction or merely according to strict justice. Thus to emphasise the freeness of salvation he assigns the application of salvation to the work of Christ’s intercession in heaven. Goodwin grounds this in the Day of Atonement ritual in which the high priest would enter the Most Holy Place with blood and with incense (which represents prayers). God prescribed the rite ‘to show that heaven is not opened by mere justice, or bringing only a price in hand for it, but by grace also, and that must be entreated.’¹⁰⁶ When multiple attributes are displayed the glory of God is maximised.

Second, God ordained Christ’s intercession in heaven to be an integral part of our salvation in addition to his death on earth in order to assure us of the security of our redemption. Christians are saved, Goodwin says, ‘all manner of ways, over and over.’¹⁰⁷ First by his death, then secondly by his resurrection, ascension, and session at God’s right hand, and thirdly, by his intercession. Each alone would have been sufficient but all three together makes our salvation even more inviolable.¹⁰⁸

Goodwin pays particular attention to the act of intercession for our encouragement by showing that the whole application of Christ’s work on the cross depends on it. He says that ‘all divines’ differentiate between the effect of Christ’s death on our salvation and the effect of his intercession, by

calling his death *medium impetrationis*, that is, the means of procurement or obtaining it for us; but his intercession *medium applicationis*, the means of applying all unto us. Christ purchaseth salvation by the one, but possesseth us of it by the other.¹⁰⁹

His intercession ‘is the applying cause of our eternal salvation, in all the parts of it, first and last.’¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁵ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:62.

¹⁰⁶ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:62.

¹⁰⁷ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:63.

¹⁰⁸ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:63.

¹⁰⁹ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:63.

¹¹⁰ *Christ Set Forth, Works* 4:63.

With the previous two reasons for the Father's ordination of the intercessory work of Christ as the backdrop, we can now see the third reason why God designed our redemption to depend on the Mediator's ongoing prayers for his people. It has reference to Christ himself

whose honour and glory, and the perpetuation of it in our hearts, God had as well in his eye in the ordering all the workings of our salvation, as much as his own 'that all might honour the Son as well as the Father,' as Christ himself speaks.¹¹¹

So that Christ would receive constant honour and glory the Father does not wish to have his Son ever 'to be out of office, nor out of work.'¹¹² He does not wish him to receive honour only on the basis of what he did 'as great generals have, even in time of peace, the glory of some great battle fought, continued to them in their titles, or rewards forever.'¹¹³ God wants him to have 'a perpetual spring of honour by new work, and employment in that office which he is continually a-doing, so to preserve the verdure of his glory ever fresh and green, and therefore ordained a continual work for him.'¹¹⁴ Because our salvation depends both on what Christ has done and on what he is continually doing he receives perpetual glory and praise from his people.¹¹⁵

There is another glory that accrues to Christ in heaven which is a result of his mediatorial work. In heaven he is the only one through whom the prayers of God's saints arise to God. Goodwin writes:

it is part of his glory to sit on God's right hand and to be the only Mediator, and that not only in his name should prayers be put up, but that none else should be employed to put up prayers besides.¹¹⁶

Conclusion

We have now seen how Goodwin explains the mediatorial work of the God-man. Since sin dishonours the manifestative glory of God, Christ, the God-man, agrees to have

¹¹¹ *Christ Set Forth, Works 4:66.*

¹¹² *Christ Set Forth, Works 4:66.*

¹¹³ *Christ Set Forth, Works 4:67.*

¹¹⁴ *Christ Set Forth, Works 4:67.*

¹¹⁵ Goodwin reiterates this point in his discussion of 1 Thess 1:10-11 where he writes that our arrival in glory 'makes up a crown of glory to him,' and that our glory is designed 'for the greatening of his, so also our continuing in grace, to the end that he may be then glorified in us (having been so kept by him), is made a great additional unto his honour.' *Of Election, Works 9:366-367.*

¹¹⁶ *Ephesians, Works 1:81.*

his manifestative glory diminished and, in this way, make satisfaction for sin. However, although the Mediator must have an essential glory as God to give worth to his mediatorial work, his essential glory cannot be diminished. Therefore, Goodwin argues that Christ has an additional glory, unique to him, the diminishing of which can be offered to God for satisfaction. This glory, which Goodwin terms Christ's personal glory, is crucial for the success of Christ's mediatorial work.

Goodwin points out that in addition to making satisfaction for sin, Christ's mediatorial work also includes his defeat of Satan and his ongoing ministry of intercession at God's right hand. Thus there are many reasons why Goodwin can speak of Christ's mediatorial glory, the glory that accrues to Christ because of his mediatorial work.

In closing this chapter on the mediatorial glory of the God-man it is important to underscore two significant considerations: (i) Christ's mediatorial glory depends on both his essential and his personal glory, and, (ii) however illustrious his mediatorial glory may be, it is secondary to his personal glory, the glory he has as God-man quite apart from his work of redemption. To a discussion of Christ's personal glory we will now turn.

Chapter 3: The Personal Glory of the God-Man

Thus far we have looked at Goodwin's treatment of the essential and mediatorial glory of Christ. We noted that the essential glory of the second person of the Trinity is the foundation or substratum of Goodwin's Christology.¹ His discussion of the mediatorial glory of Christ is most prominent in his *Works* because it is most spoken about in the Scriptures. However, the God-man has another glory and it is in fact *this glory* which is the centre of Goodwin's Christology.

This he calls Christ's manifestative, or, personal glory. Goodwin holds that according to Colossians 1:15 'there is a double image of God in Christ; the one *essential*, as he is second person; the other *manifestative*, as the glory of God shines in the face or person of Jesus Christ, as man.'² This manifestative glory, he is careful to highlight, refers to 'the glory and royalties of this great person, who, as God-man in one person, is sovereign Lord over all.'³ It is the 'glories which attend and are due to that human nature united personally to the Son of God.'⁴ That is, this manifestative glory has reference to the second person, not simply as God, but as the God-man.

Furthermore, not only is this manifestative glory distinct from the glory Christ has as the second person of the Trinity, it is also to be distinguished from the glory that accrues to Christ as the Mediator of God's elect. Goodwin thus addresses the glory of Christ's person 'abstracted from the work of redeeming us men from sins and wrath.'⁵ He writes of the glory of 'his person simply, considered as God-man,'⁶ and 'of his office of mediatorship; which latter was superadded, over and above, unto the glory of his person, as God-man.'⁷

One can observe a descending scale of glory within Goodwin's theology of the thrice glorious second person of the Trinity. (i) His essential glory is unsurpassed and cannot be added to or diminished. It is the foundation of and vastly superior to (ii) the glory Christ has as the God-man, ordained to be so from all eternity by the Father. Indeed, the glory

¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:461.

² *Knowledge, Works* 4:462.

³ *Knowledge, Works* 4:454.

⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:455.

⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:455.

⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:493.

⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:493.

Christ has as the God-man, his manifestative glory, is but the reflection and effect of his essential glory and so inferior to the glory which the second person has in common with his Father.⁸ In turn, that manifestative, or personal, glory is the precursor to and outshines (iii) the glory of the Lord Jesus as the Redeemer of his people.⁹ Thus for Goodwin, Christ has a threefold glory, one glory, essential, belonging to him as God, and then as God-man, possessing a ‘double glory,’¹⁰ personal and mediatorial.

This schema raises an important question: If the personal glory of Christ is inferior to his essential glory, is it proper to designate it as the centre of Goodwin’s Christology? To this an affirmative answer can be given because, as Mark Jones notes, the ‘essential glory of the divine Son receives relatively little attention in Goodwin’s expositions on Christ’s glory compared to the twofold glory related to his person and work as the God-man.’¹¹ And, ‘[t]he greater part of Goodwin’s exposition of Christ’s glory is taken up with his glory considered as the God-man.’¹² There are theological reasons,¹³ as will become evident, why Christ’s essential glory, though superior to his personal glory as the God-man abstracted from his work of redemption, has a subordinate place in Goodwin’s Christology.

At this stage it is necessary to flesh out a number of things concerning the personal union of the second person of the Trinity with humanity.

At the beginning of Book II of *The Knowledge of God the Father, and His Son Jesus Christ*,¹⁴ Goodwin commences his discussion of the Lord Jesus Christ, who he was from all eternity and what he became when ordained to become the God-man. Goodwin states

⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:463.

⁹ What is driving Goodwin here is not any desire to diminish the glory of Christ’s work of redemption. He indeed speaks of it as a glory, but a glory that is ‘superadded, over and above, unto the glory of his person, as God-man.’ *Knowledge, Works* 4:493. He does not mean that it is a superior glory to Christ’s personal glory but that it was in addition to his personal glory which is vastly superior. Rather than diminishing the mediatorial glory of Christ, Goodwin wishes to maximise Christ’s personal glory as the God-man. He writes that the benefits of Christ’s mediatorial work such as redemption and heaven which believers receive by faith ‘are all far inferior to the gift of his person unto us, and much more to the glory of his person itself. His person is of infinite more worth than they all can be of.’ *Ephesians, Works* 1:99.

¹⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:493.

¹¹ Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 255.

¹² Jones, *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 255.

¹³ One being the permanent nature of the hypostatic union. ‘But if God decree his Son to subsist in a human nature once, then his being ever as a man, and God for ever to dwell in him, is the natural consequent of the former; for the union is indissoluble.’ *Knowledge, Works* 4:475.

¹⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:404-453.

that a misstep here will cause us to stumble in our understanding of the whole religion. Thus it is crucial to know *who* Christ is and *what* he is.

Goodwin explicates this by making and defending from Scripture three assertions. The first is that this person who is the Christ existed from all eternity.¹⁵ Second, that Christ, as to the substance of his person, is the Son of God, not just when he took a human nature but from all eternity.¹⁶ Finally, Goodwin asserts that Christ is God, one and the same in essence (*homoousios*) with God the Father.¹⁷

What is the Nature of the Union Between God and Man?

This triple assertion, that Christ is eternal, eternally the Son of God, and eternally God, sets the stage for Goodwin to address the ‘great mystery of our religion.’¹⁸ Elsewhere he asks, ‘What was the greatest work of wonder that ever God did in the world?’ and answers, ‘It was the incarnation of the Son of God.’¹⁹ In the creation of the world God is revealed (Romans 1:19-20). ‘But God manifest in the flesh is an even higher kind of manifestation, for there he is present. We may say of it, Here God is a visible God in his person.’²⁰

The incarnation means that Jesus Christ is God and man in one person forever. He who was of essence God took the nature of man in union with himself.

Christ may be said to be made man, and to be as essentially man as he is God; made, not as water was made wine, and ceasing to be water, but both natures remaining distinct, are made one person, so as both become one Lord and one Christ.²¹

This union is so real that ‘in the concrete the man Christ may be called God, and the Son of God. . . Though the manhood cannot be called the Godhead.’²² Not only can the man be

¹⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:407-420.

¹⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:420-428.

¹⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:428-438.

¹⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:438.

¹⁹ *The Holy Ghost, Works* 6:418.

²⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:438.

²¹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5: 51.

²² *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:51.

designated God ‘but the Godhead is said to dwell in him, and the fullness of the Godhead to fill that human nature.’²³

He is careful to note that it was human *nature* that the second person of the Trinity assumed, not a human *person*. Christ ‘took not the person of a man, but man to be a person with himself.’²⁴ That is, the human nature he assumed was *anhypostatic*. It was the personhood of the second person of the Godhead that was communicated to the human nature assumed.

Goodwin admits that because of this, Christ’s ‘human nature differs from ours; but that difference is not in any part of the substance of our natures, but only . . . a difference in the matter of subsisting.’²⁵ Despite this difference, Goodwin insists that Christ

took our whole nature for substance, every way as perfect as ours, in all the parts of it, both of soul and body. . . . There was nothing wanting essential to either, or for the perfection of either part of our nature, for he will be like us in all things, in all members of our bodies, and faculties of our souls.²⁶

In fact, because Christ gave personhood to a human nature the salvation of humanity is possible. Goodwin writes:

This will fit us well, for now all that Christ as God doth, the man Christ shall be said to do for us, that so it may be ours; and all that Christ man doth, Christ God shall be said to do, that it may have an infinite merit in it.²⁷

The eternal Son of God who became man, while remaining essentially God and becoming essentially man, acts as God in our nature to bring us salvation.

²³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:51.

²⁴ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:51.

²⁵ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:53.

²⁶ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:54.

²⁷ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:52. In this context it is helpful to note the Reformed distinction between *totus Christus* and *totum Christi* that arises from the insistence of the divine personality of the God-man. Richard A. Muller writes: ‘The *totus Christus*, i.e., the whole person of Christ is omnipresent, inasmuch as the divine person is, by virtue of his divinity, omnipresent; but the *totum Christi*, all of Christ, i.e. both natures, cannot be omnipresent, since the human nature must be in one place.’ *Dictionary of Terms*, 305.

What are the Glories that Belong to Christ the God-man?

Goodwin states that Christians have diminished Christ's glory by focussing too narrowly on his glory as a redeemer. He traces this to sinners' elation due to their rescue from sin because of the mediatorial work of Christ. There is, however, another stream of revenue of glory flowing to Christ in that he is the God-man.²⁸

In Book III of *The Knowledge of God the Father, and his Son Jesus Christ*²⁹ Goodwin addresses himself to 'the glory of [Christ's] person, and the relation thereof, simply considered and abstracted from the work of redeeming us men from sins and wrath.'³⁰ This glory of the God-man, is delineated in two ways as the glory 'inherent in him' and the glory 'adherent or appertaining to him.'³¹

A. Inherent Glory

The glory inherent in him is the glory Christ has by virtue of the hypostatic union between the second person of the Godhead and man. As such, Christ is the 'image of the invisible God' (Colossians 1:15) and the attributes of the divine essence, which are invisible, are made visible in Christ. He argues that in this verse Paul is referring to Christ, not simply as second person of the holy Trinity, but to Christ as the God-man. It could not be a reference to Christ as second person because '[t]he Godhead and person of Christ, considered simply as second person, is in himself as invisible as the Godhead, or person of the Father.'³² In Christ, the God-man, we see 'an edition of the Godhead, in all the perfections of it'³³ though inferior to Christ's essential glory just as the rays of the sun are inferior to the sun itself.³⁴

Goodwin further argues that this image of the divine attributes in the God-man is not a 'bare communication of properties, so as only that which is said of the Godhead is predicated of the manhood.'³⁵ Nor is it that the manhood uses divine attributes, for

²⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:454.

²⁹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:454-569.

³⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:454-5.

³¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:455.

³² *Knowledge, Works* 4:462.

³³ *Knowledge, Works* 4:462.

³⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:463.

³⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:463.

example, that the humanity of the God-man ‘is omniscient with the omniscience of the divine nature.’³⁶ It is that the divine attributes really become attributes of the human nature in the highest possible manner that infinite attributes can be communicated to a finite creature. He writes:

[The] fulness of perfections really inherent and appertaining unto the manhood, by virtue of that its union with the divine nature, as although infinitely coming short of the attributes that are essential to the Godhead, yet is the completest image of them.³⁷

To illustrate his meaning, Goodwin refers to the divine attribute of omniscience. Goodwin reflects on Colossians 2 and draws a connection between what Paul says in v. 3 about Christ, ‘In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge’ and in v. 9, ‘For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily.’ He writes, ‘Now the reason of all this fulness of wisdom in Christ is there given, that the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily (or personally) in him.’³⁸

We have already seen that Goodwin follows the maxim *finitum non capax infiniti* and so he is careful to add that the wisdom Christ has in his human nature is not the same as that which God has in himself. To insist on such would make Christ’s ‘human nature God.’³⁹ Instead, ‘there is a similitudinary omniscency in Christ’s human nature, . . . now glorified.’⁴⁰ Not the same omniscience, but a similar one, as similar as is possible in a human nature.

The hypostatic union has an influence on the man Jesus so that in the God-man we see the glory of God, that glory which Christ, as second person of the Godhead, has in himself. But Christ’s essential glory cannot be seen any more than we can see the essential glory of the Father. ‘Therefore . . . this Godhead dwells bodily in a human nature, that so shining through the lantern of his flesh we might behold it.’⁴¹ Whatever glory there is in

³⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:463.

³⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:463.

³⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:464.

³⁹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:464.

⁴⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:464. The qualification ‘now glorified’ is not insignificant in Goodwin’s Christology. He is speaking here of Christ as God-man after his exaltation when Christ received the glory that he had upon his appointment as God-man and prior to his incarnation, a glory that was suspended during his incarnation.

⁴¹ *Glory of the Gospel, Works* 4:232.

the Godhead is communicated to the humanity of Christ hypostatically united to the eternal Son of God.

B. Adherent Glory

In contrast to Christ's inherent glory as God-man by virtue of the hypostatic union, there are also glories given to him, what Goodwin calls glory adherent to him, which are part of his personal glory.

Christ is the first in the order of God's decrees. Goodwin mines this from Paul's statements 'he is the firstborn of every creature' (Colossians 1:15) and 'he is before all things' (Colossians 1:17). Goodwin does not treat these words as a proof text for eternal generation stating that there are other passages which teach this 'more plainly and directly.'⁴² For him, that Christ is the firstborn of every creature means two things.

First, it refers to the God-man becoming a creature upon his assumption of the human nature, although he has priority and dignity and honour over all other creatures. That is why it cannot refer to his eternal generation because this refers to Christ as God, and 'God would never have condescended so low, speaking of the eternal generation of his Son, as to compare him therein with creatures.'⁴³ Goodwin sums up this point by noting that although the God-man is a creature he is 'a prince of all creatures.'⁴⁴

More significantly, being firstborn of all creatures highlights that he was the first in the order of God's decrees. Note how Goodwin discusses this. One of his favourite pictures in describing God's eternal decrees is taken from gynaecology. He speaks of the 'vast womb of eternity'⁴⁵ and 'the womb of election'⁴⁶ and the 'womb of God's decrees.'⁴⁷ The particular decrees issue from this womb of God's eternal purpose as babies issue from a mother's womb. 'The womb is the eternal decrees and purposes of God.'⁴⁸

⁴² *Knowledge, Works* 4:468.

⁴³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:74.

⁴⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:470.

⁴⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:26.

⁴⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:74.

⁴⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 2:316.

⁴⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:470.

It is within this context that Goodwin understands Christ as the firstborn of all creatures. He was decreed to be the God-man prior to all other decrees, that is, he was predestined as the God-man, absolutely. As Goodwin expresses it in a sermon on Hebrews 1:1-2, ‘he was the firstborn in the womb of God’s predestination.’⁴⁹

Closely connected to this, Goodwin also sees the priority of the God-man in the phrase in Colossians 1:17, ‘And he is before all things.’ This has to do with the order of God’s intention in eternity. Referring to Proverbs 8:22, which Goodwin applies to Christ, he says that in the contemplation of God’s works *ad extra*, Christ holds first place ‘as the richest treasure of all his glory to be manifested in his creation, without which he would not have proceeded to any other work . . . but rested in that blessed society of the Three without them.’⁵⁰

Goodwin is affirming two things here. First, if Christ had not been ordained as the God-man there would have been no further ordination or creation. Second, he was the firstborn and may well have been, had God so determined, the only born. He is before all things.

Goodwin is not attributing either temporality or a chronological order to the eternal decrees but rather a logical interconnectedness. God ‘view[s] and ordain[s] all his works *ad extra*, at once.’⁵¹ Yet ‘one thing decreed by God is ordered by his will to have a reference unto, or dependence upon another thing, though at the same time decreed.’⁵² And although the decrees and purposes of God ‘is the common womb, both of Jesus Christ, as he is God-man, and of all creatures else,’⁵³ Christ the God-man was the first to exit the womb.

The second glory that makes up the glories adherent to him is, Goodwin insists from Colossians 1:16, that all things were created by Christ and ‘for him.’ Christ ‘was set up as a universal end of the whole creation of God.’⁵⁴ That is, all things were created for Christ’s glory, a priority which is ‘a similitudinary prerogative of what God alone is.’⁵⁵ Christ

⁴⁹ *Three Sermons*, Works 5:541.

⁵⁰ *Knowledge*, Works 4:471.

⁵¹ *Knowledge*, Works 4:470.

⁵² *Knowledge*, Works 4:474.

⁵³ *Knowledge*, Works 4:470.

⁵⁴ *Knowledge*, Works 4:472.

⁵⁵ *Knowledge*, Works 4:472.

derives glory from the creation to the glory of God because the Father is greater than he is, as God-man. Christ is the end for whom all things were created, not just by God's decree, but because, once he was decreed to be God-man he was considered by God to be deserving of being the end of all creatures.⁵⁶

To these two glories, namely that Christ was the first of all of God's decrees and the one for whom all things were created, both by decree and desert, Goodwin adds a third. '[I]t was withal his due to be ordained by God the end of all things decreed together with him.'⁵⁷ Goodwin explains this last point syllogistically. If the second person of the Trinity was ordained by God to subsist in a human nature (which was not necessary but due to the free will of God), and, if God determined to create other creatures (which he was under no obligation to do but which he did actually do), 'then it becomes the necessary due of this Christ, and that as God-man, so decreed, to be set up by God in those his decrees, as the end of all these things.'⁵⁸

In his design God should therefore arrange the decree of all things for Christ's glory. That is, there should be intentionality to his design. Goodwin is arguing here that Christ has a double right to glory, first, as the God-man by a 'necessary consequent of that union'⁵⁹ and, second, because God 'shaped these his decrees accordingly.'⁶⁰

Goodwin's point here is that this glory of Christ, that of having a natural right to it, is unique to him and shared by no other creature. He illustrates this with reference to the creation of humanity. The apostle Paul writes in 1 Corinthians 11:9, 'The man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man.' But that order, Goodwin argues, was not necessary. '[I]t was not a due that if both man and woman should be created, the woman should be for the man.'⁶¹ This 'was a matter of mere arbitrariness and pure liberty unto God.'⁶² It was different with Christ.

⁵⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:472.

⁵⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:473.

⁵⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:473.

⁵⁹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:474.

⁶⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:475.

⁶¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:475.

⁶² *Knowledge, Works* 4:475.

For although (as was said) that he should subsist in man's nature, that depended merely upon a decree, and was in no respect his due; but that he should be the heir, the Lord, the end of all things, is so the object of God's will and decree, as withal he may claim it (supposing an intention in God, that he will be God-man at all) as a due, and royalty, and prerogative entitled to his being decreed God's Son, by the supremest law that can come between God and his Son, which cannot be made void, or he be bereaved of that prerogative.⁶³

If God should ordain anything, it is simultaneously ordained for his own glory and the glory of the God-man.

Goodwin offers an additional example of the personal glory of Christ as God-man. The backdrop here is God's intention to create anything at all. Goodwin says that two eminent ends for which God created all things are 'the manifestation of himself, and his glorious perfections to creatures reasonable, that they might glorify him,' and 'to shew his love, and communicate his goodness unto those creatures reasonable, which he would set himself to love.'⁶⁴

Christ's glory is that he, even 'without the superadded project of redemption,'⁶⁵ is the highest possible manifestation of the glory of God, higher 'than if millions of several worlds had been created every day on purpose to reveal God to us.'⁶⁶

Further, in the union of the two natures in the God-man, God has shown his love and communicated his goodness in the highest possible way. Christ is 'the epitome, the compendium'⁶⁷ of creation and in showing his love to the God-man, God gives 'the utmost

⁶³ *Knowledge, Works* 4:475.

⁶⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:477.

⁶⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:477.

⁶⁶ *Glory of the Gospel, Works* 4:232.

⁶⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:480. Goodwin develops this thought of Christ as the epitome of all creation in his discussion of the words 'that he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, and which are on earth' (Eph 1:10). The all things in heaven refer to 'sorts of intelligent creatures' . . . 'angels in heaven, and men on earth.' *Ephesians, Works* 1:149. Human nature itself is a miniature world summing up both the heavenly world and the earthly world. 'Man's nature being the epitome of all, the centre of both worlds, higher and lower,—the elements, vegetatives, sensitive creatures,—man is the little idea of all species or kinds of things.' *Ephesians, Works* 1:154. So when Christ took human nature he sums up both worlds in himself 'for who of creatures so fit to be made "Lord of all things," by that God "for whom are all things," but he that is the sum and contract of all sorts of creatures that ever God should make.' *Knowledge, Works* 4:529.

pledge of his love to his whole creation,’⁶⁸ but especially ‘to man, the darling of his creation.’⁶⁹

Referencing the law ‘that *bonum est sui communicativum*, that is, that goodness is communicative’ and that ‘the highest good is communicative of himself in the highest way,’⁷⁰ Goodwin argues that the best way God could communicate his goodness to his creatures was ‘by a personal union of some person [of the Godhead] with a creature responsible.’⁷¹ So God communicated his goodness to the man Jesus, and, through the God-man, God communicates himself to those who are united to Christ.

Therefore, the God-man is the highest manifestation of God’s glory and the highest possible expression of his love. This is a glory that belongs to no other creature.

Christ’s Prayer

Goodwin’s interaction with Jesus’ prayer in John 17, particularly verse 5, (‘Glorify me now with the glory which I had with thee before the world was’) highlights the salient points of his view of the personal glory of the God-man. Goodwin poses a number of questions and answers them to elucidate his teaching on the glory of the God-man.

First, he asks whether this request of Jesus is to be understood as Christ speaking simply as second person of the Trinity or as the God-man. He asserts the subject of the prayer is the man Jesus who, having finished his work, ‘prays for that glory wherein in heaven (when glorified) he should appear visibly in his human nature.’⁷²

Secondly, he asks in what sense can the man Jesus ask for the glory he had before the world existed. Enlisting the support of Augustine,⁷³ Goodwin says that the glory he had

⁶⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:480.

⁶⁹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:480.

⁷⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:480.

⁷¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:480.

⁷² *Knowledge, Works* 4:485.

⁷³ Augustine writes: ‘But this predestination He still more clearly disclosed in respect of His own glorification, wherewith He was glorified by the Father, when He added, “With the glory which I had, before the world was, with You.” The proper order of the words is, “which I had with You before the world was.” To this apply His words, “And now glorify Thou me;” that is to say, as then, so also now: as then, by predestination; so also now, by consummation: do Thou in the world what had already been done with Thee before the world: do in its own time what You have determined before all times.’ *Tractates on the Gospel of John*, 105:6.

before the world existed, was the glory of ‘God’s singular predestination of him constituted God-man,’⁷⁴ ‘that personal glory of and flowing from the personal union, which was by predestination given him as God-man.’⁷⁵

Goodwin insists that this glory cannot be a reference to Christ’s essential glory as the second person of the Godhead.⁷⁶ If it was essential glory that Christ was referring to, that was not something he needed to pray for, nor did he ever lose it. On the other hand, it would be incongruous for the man Jesus to pray for God to grant him essential glory. Christ must be asking for the glory of being constituted the God-man by God’s predestination.

Thirdly, Goodwin asks how the God-man could be said to have glory before the world was when he did not yet exist as the God-man until his incarnation. Goodwin’s first response is to say that the person of the God-man, being the eternal Son of God, did exist when he was predestined to be the God-man. Coupled with this,

the second person, the Son did, at, and together, and upon God’s act of predestinating him to be God-man . . . take on him the real title and repute of God-man, and sustaining and bore the personage of God-man afore his Father. And his Father actually gave him the glory of it, as a super-added glory to that of his being second person, and his Son simply considered.⁷⁷

When Christ accepted the office of God-man, along with its title, ‘[h]e was thenceforward God-man contracted, although the marriage was to be after consummated, when the Word took flesh.’⁷⁸ Goodwin sums up his answer this way:

This title was in itself truly a glory, though but an additional, given the second person then existing; and though the man, or the human nature was not existent, yet the glory of his being one day man was then existent, and the person was existent that was capable of receiving even that glory at that present.⁷⁹

⁷⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:485.

⁷⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:486.

⁷⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:487.

⁷⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:489.

⁷⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:490.

⁷⁹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:491.

In his fourth question Goodwin asks what kind of glory Christ prays for in John 17:5. Pointing out that Christ has ‘a threefold glory,’ the one essential, another personal and the third, mediatorial, he says that John 17:5 refers to Christ’s personal glory. This was

to be taken up into the glory of God. It was not upon the account of what he had done in this world, as in relation unto us and our eternal life, but what simply arose from the union and communion which he had, and was to have entirely with his Father, singly and alone . . . and such as would have been if there were no world, nor had been extant; and so it was without relation unto his work done, or persons in this world whom eternal life should be given unto.⁸⁰

Goodwin insists that this personal glory was not dependent on what Christ achieved. The ‘now’ of John 17:5, ‘And *now*, O Father, glorify thou me,’ is a ‘now’ of subsequence not of consequence. His glory follows his sufferings but is not due to his sufferings. Goodwin reinforces that Christ is speaking of his personal glory by pointing out that Christ asks his Father, ‘glorify thou me *with thine own self*.’ ‘With thine own self’ is not a reference to the place where Christ should be glorified, Goodwin contends, but ‘of God’s glorifying him in, and with, and by the glory God himself had, and with that glory alone, abstracted from all other things whatsoever.’⁸¹

In John 17:5, therefore, according to Goodwin, Jesus prays for God to grant him, the God-man, the full enjoyment of the riches of the glory of the God-head to which he had been predestined.

Conclusion

This chapter presented an overview of Goodwin’s understanding of the personal glory of the God-man. It demonstrated that Christ, considered abstracted both from who he is as the second person of the Trinity simply considered and what he has done as the God-man and Redeemer, has a personal glory as God-man. He has this glory because by virtue of the hypostatic union all the glory of the Godhead dwells in him bodily. Furthermore, since as the God-man he has a right to glory, all other things have been ordained for him. The second Person of the Trinity has been ordained to be God-man for his own glory and as the highest manifestation of God’s glory and the highest expression of love, a privilege he shares with no other creature.

⁸⁰ *Knowledge, Works* 4:495.

⁸¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:496.

Furthermore, Christ received this personal glory, not at his incarnation, but at his appointment to and acceptance of the office of Mediator.

At the beginning of this chapter it was stated that this personal glory of the God-man is the centre of Goodwin's Christology. To demonstrate that is the burden of the next chapter.

Chapter 4: The Centrality of the Personal Glory of the God-Man

The threefold glory of the second person of the Trinity has been explored in previous chapters. He has a glory as God; this Goodwin terms his essential glory. He has a glory as the God-man which Goodwin calls Christ's personal, or manifestative, glory. Finally, Christ has a glory as the Redeemer of God's elect; this Goodwin calls Christ's mediatorial glory.

The essential glory of the second person is not often on the surface of Goodwin's writings. That does not mean, however, that it is absent from his Christology. The essential glory is the '*substratum* and foundation'¹ of his Christological reflections.

This is obviously true in the matter of Christ's personal glory. It is the second person of the Godhead who has taken to himself a human nature, both virtually in eternity and actually in the incarnation. This is the reason Christ is the God-man. If he were not essentially God, Christ could never have become the God-man by hypostatic union.

The essential glory of the second person is also the '*substratum* and foundation' of Christ's mediatorial glory because his person, being the second person of the Trinity, gives value to his mediatorial labours. Goodwin writes, 'So that which puts the value on Christ's satisfaction was the worth of his person.'² 'And therefore, as the worth of Christ's person was infinite, so must the worth of his actions be.'³

It is evident, therefore, that there is a vital connection between the second person's threefold glories as seen in the relation between his essential glory and the other two glories. The foundational character of Christ's essential glory means that it does not need to surface in Goodwin's Christology just as the foundation of a house is hidden to human observation. It does not, for that reason, cease to be important or essential.

There is also a relationship between the God-man's double glory. His personal glory was the foundation of his mediatorial glory because only the God-man could be the

¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:461, 518, 546, 555.

² *Revelation, Works* 3:8.

³ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:104.

Mediator. Without the one he could not have the other. But this relationship is not reciprocal. In Goodwin's Christology Christ could be the God-man even if he were not the mediator.

Goodwin's Christology gives a definite priority to the personal glory of Christ. He asks and answers his own question:

If you would ask, which of these two glories belonging to God-man are the greatest? Your own thoughts, I believe, have by this time cast and determined, that this of his personal glory doth infinitely exceed that of his mediatory glory.⁴

This chapter will demonstrate the pride of place given to Christ's personal glory which leads to the conclusion that this glory is the centre of Goodwin's Christology.

Hypostatic Union Ordained for Christ's Glory

One approach to seeing the primacy of the person of Christ is by exploring what Goodwin says regarding the appointment of the second Person to become God-man.

The primary reason for the hypostatic union was the glory of Christ. Goodwin acknowledges that Christ was also chosen to be the God-man for the redemption of fallen humanity but this was not God's first intention. 'Upon the glorifying this second Person did God's decree primarily pitch.'⁵ What chiefly prompted the Father to ordain Christ to be the God-man? 'I say, it was Christ and the glory of his person.'⁶ As noted in the last chapter, Christ the God-man 'was the firstborn in the womb of God's predestination'⁷ and this decree was birthed for the glory of the person of the God-man.

Humanity Created for Christ's Glory

The primacy of the person of Christ can be seen, secondly, in Goodwin's discussion of the creation of man. It was noted above⁸ that the Trinity purposed to share their happy society and mutual union and communion with creatures. Hence, one of the reasons for the creation of humanity was for believers' union and communion with the Triune God.

⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:498.

⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:98.

⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:100.

⁷ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:541.

⁸ See above, 10-13.

However, Goodwin adds an additional, and more foundational, reason: humans are created for Christ, the God-man's, companionship. 'When one hath a son that is marriageable, he thinks of a wife, a companion for him; and thus the Father did for his Son, and chose the persons whom, and gave them him.'⁹

To explore this, it is necessary to examine Goodwin's understanding of the order of the decrees. He addresses this in a number of places, most significantly in *An Exposition of the First Chapter of the Epistle to the Ephesians*¹⁰ and in his treatise entitled, *Of Election*.¹¹

Although 'God doth all at once'¹² in his eternal decree, 'whose infinite understanding grasps and comprehends all in one prospect, as he doth all time into an instant, being all present to God,'¹³ God 'condescendeth to our apprehensions'¹⁴ and thus we see 'that there are two plots or designs that God had towards us.'¹⁵ His 'primary plot, which was first in his intention . . . was to choose us to that state which we shall be in heaven.'¹⁶ His secondary plot, 'subordinate to the other . . . was to redeem us and reconcile us unto himself by his Son Jesus Christ.'¹⁷

These two designs correspond to Goodwin's understanding of the order of the decrees. He acknowledges two extreme positions in this connection, specifically with reference to whether man was considered as fallen or unfallen when chosen by God.

Goodwin eschews both extremes and takes a middle position. Rather than seeing man as unfallen *or* fallen, Goodwin posits that God has both conditions in view 'and that some sort of his decrees respected man as unfallen, and some as fallen.'¹⁸ Goodwin accepts the common distinction when discussing the decrees of God, namely, that of ends and

⁹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:501.

¹⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:1-564.

¹¹ *Of Election, Works* 9:1-498.

¹² *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

¹³ *Of Election, Works* 9:344.

¹⁴ *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

¹⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

¹⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

¹⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

¹⁸ *Of Election, Works* 9:344. Goodwin claims Calvin for this view and asserts this is the reason Calvin can be cited both for an election out of *massa corrupta* and *massa pura*. *Of Election, Works* 9:93. Goodwin notes that Scotus does something similar in his discussion of election and reprobation. *Of Election, Works* 9:92-93.

means.¹⁹ The ultimate end of God's decrees, that being the 'fullness of glory God designed to bring his elect into,'²⁰ is distinguished from the means employed 'to accomplish or bring us through unto the attaining of this end.'²¹ The means refer to what Christ as Redeemer does *for* his people and *in* his people to prepare them for glory.²² Adam's creation and his sin, on the other hand, are not means to the end; both are 'but such matters as common providence.'²³ Goodwin summarises his position in this way:

God having all afore him in his immense understanding, had in his purpose of election to the end a respect unto man considered as unfallen, but in that to these means, unto man considered as fallen; and decreed both, and all in one and the same determination of his divine will.²⁴

Thus Goodwin is *supralapsarian* in a distinct way. In fact, he differentiates himself from 'the pure superlapsarian'²⁵ in that he does not include Adam's creation and fall into sin as means to the end. He refers approvingly to 'that judicious and good divine Keckermanus' and quotes his comment that the fall is 'an impediment' rather than a means to God's decree that the elect should be brought into union and communion with God.²⁶ The creation of Adam, Goodwin writes, 'was not a means at all of that glory' and with regard to the sin of Adam he categorically states, 'no man must say that it was a means.'²⁷

¹⁹ *Of Election*, Works 9:84.

²⁰ *Of Election*, Works 9:84. Goodwin also refers to this as the 'beatifical vision' (*Ephesians*, Works 1:180) or 'union and communion' with God (*Of Election*, Works 9:148).

²¹ *Of Election*, Works 9:84.

²² *Of Election*, Works 9:84.

²³ *Of Election*, Works 9:85.

²⁴ *Of Election*, Works 9:86.

²⁵ Goodwin employs the term *superlapsarian* for *supralapsarian*.

²⁶ *Of Election*, Works 9:86. Bartholomew Keckerman (1571-1609) was a Calvinist professor at Danzig.

²⁷ *Of Election*, Works 9:84-84. Thus Michael S. Horton incorrectly states Goodwin's position: 'With respect to the end, the decree to elect was infralapsarian' and 'Therefore, Goodwin is an infralapsarian Calvinist.' *Goodwin and Assurance*, 64, 66. Although he does not reference Thomas Goodwin, J. V. Fesko deals with the lapsarian debate at the Westminster Assembly in his chapter entitled, 'The Westminster Confession and Lapsarianism: Calvin and the Divines.' He concludes that the Westminster divines 'specify the object of predestination as *homo creatus et lapsus*' and bases that on their statement in WCF 3:6 'Wherefore they who are elected being fallen in Adam. . .' *Westminster Into the 21st*, Vol. 2, 494. That is not a necessary conclusion from that statement as one could believe that election was out of *homo creabilis et labilis* and also speak of the elect as subsequently fallen and needing redemption in Christ. That is, the Confession can be read to state that the elect are both fallen in Adam and redeemed by Christ, without addressing whether the decree is infralapsarian or supralapsarian. Certainly, as we have seen, Goodwin, a delegate to the Assembly and a supralapsarian, speaks of the elect as chosen out of unfallen humanity and who subsequently need redemption out of their fallen condition. Derek Thomas makes the same point in his article 'The Westminster Consensus on the Decree: The Infra/Supra Lapsarian Debate.' He states that the statement in the Confession, 'they who are elected, being fallen in Adam', could be adopted by both lapsarian positions because 'both groups read these statements differently—the

Thus God has two designs with regard to the elect which are reflected in the order of the decrees regarding end and means.

Further, these two designs correlate to the two relations the elect have with Christ, the God-man. Referencing Ephesians 5:23 Goodwin asserts that Christ is head of the Church in God's consideration of the elect as unfallen, and that he is the Saviour in relation to those same elect now considered as fallen.²⁸

To illustrate the God-man's relationship to the elect as head, Goodwin employs the metaphor of marriage and uses Adam and Eve as types, respectively, of Christ and his elect.

Adam, you know, was Christ's type²⁹. . . . And look what Adam was in creation, that was Christ in election. . . . God first made Adam; and then seeing it was not fit for Adam to be alone, he brought Eve as a companion for him. So did God bring the Church unto Christ as a meet companion for him, for it was not meet that he should be alone.³⁰

Reinforcing his supralapsarianism as to end, Goodwin notes that the marriage of Eve to Adam, by which he became her head, occurred before the fall.³¹ The significance of Adam's exclamation, 'This is now bone of my bones' (Genesis 2:24) is not merely about his union to Eve but also about the marriage of Christ and his Church. That Adam spoke thus before the fall indicates that the relationship between the elect and Christ as her head was 'first decreed without the consideration had of the fall.'³² From this marriage analogy Goodwin also argues that the elect were given to Christ in eternity, not simply to him as essentially God, but 'as constituted God-man also'³³ because 'unless you suppose him set up God-man, he bears no relation to us. The wife is bone of his bone, who is the husband, which signified Christ and his church.'³⁴

supralapsarians *sub specie temporis*, the infralapsarians *sub specie aeternitatis*.' *Westminster Confession into the 21st*, Vol. 3, 283.

²⁸ *Of Election*, Works 9:344.

²⁹ Goodwin writes: '[W]e may truly say that the story of Adam is nothing else but *Christus explanatus*, Christ explained.' *Ephesians*, Works 2:415.

³⁰ *Ephesians*, Works 1:99. See Goodwin's sermon on Eph 5:30-32, especially *Ephesians*, Works 2:419-425.

³¹ *Of Election*, Works 9:343.

³² *Knowledge*, Works 4:504.

³³ *Knowledge*, Works 4:502.

³⁴ *Knowledge*, Works 4:502.

Goodwin also employs Adam as a type in explaining words that ‘have had more controversy than any so few words almost in the whole Bible,’³⁵ namely, ‘he hath chosen us in him’ (Ephesians 1:4). Adam is a type, not as a husband in this case, but as a Common Person. Dismissing other interpretations of these words, Goodwin insists that Christ ‘was not the cause of God’s electing us’ but ‘that Jesus Christ in election was the head of the elect. He was from the first considered and ordained by God as a Common Person, to represent us.’³⁶ It is similar to the situation with Adam. ‘God, in creating Adam created all mankind.’³⁷

This then, is the elect’s first union with Christ corresponding to their election as unfallen to eternal union and communion with God. They are in Christ as their head and given to him as his spouse³⁸ and companions.³⁹

That this choice of others to be Christ’s companions tends to the glory of Christ Goodwin argues on the basis of three grounds:⁴⁰

1. Christ’s glory is increased by comparison with younger companions.
2. The other companions surround him and see his glory and magnify him.
3. Christ is glorified as the cause of the elect’s adoption.⁴¹

Goodwin goes on to speak of the second relation Christ has to the elect. God ordains to permit the fall. The elect, now considered fallen in Adam, need a Redeemer. Previously related to him only as God-man they now have an additional relation to him; he is also their Saviour. In this additional relation the mediatorial glory of the God-man comes into focus.

³⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:65.

³⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:70.

³⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 1:71.

³⁸ *Ephesians, Works* 1:99.

³⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:98.

⁴⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:98-99.

⁴¹ It is appropriate to note here that Goodwin believes that adoption is a benefit of Christ’s person, not of Christ’s work. We will return to this later.

Christ acquires a second glory in addition to his glory as the God-man and head of the elect, due to his mediatorial work, but for Goodwin this additional relation as Mediator is secondary to his relation to them as head. Goodwin's language intimates this. The 'first' plot relates the elect to Christ as head; the 'after' plot to him as Redeemer.⁴² The second relation is 'subordinate and subserving the other.'⁴³ Christ redeems the elect in order that God's first intention might stand, that the God-man might have companions for his glory.

Adam in the Covenant of Works and the Glory of Christ

In the *Westminster Confession of Faith*, in which writing Goodwin played a role, the obedience of Adam and Eve to the positive command not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil would ensure that 'they were happy in their communion with God, and had dominion over the creatures.'⁴⁴ In a later chapter discussing God's covenant with man, the divines write that in the covenant of works 'life was promised to Adam, and in him to his posterity, upon condition of perfect obedience.'⁴⁵ Both chapters refrain from defining that 'communion with God' and the promised 'life' that Adam would enjoy were he to remain obedient. Was that 'life' the same as his current experience so that obedience would maintain that 'communion with God?' Or was that 'life' different from his current experience, a life not just continued in Paradise on earth but elevated to a higher level of existence, an eschatologically determined life in the new heavens and earth?

There have been various answers given to this question by Reformed theologians.⁴⁶ Goodwin's answer highlights the personal glory of the God-man and further underscores the pre-eminent place this glory has in his Christology.

⁴² *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

⁴³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

⁴⁴ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 4:2.

⁴⁵ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 7:2. Goodwin played a significant role in *The Savoy Declaration of 1658* which adopted the bulk of the *Westminster Confession of Faith*. One of the changes made, however, was in the chapter entitled 'Of God's Covenant with Man'. The first paragraph in the *Westminster Confession* reads: 'The distance between God and the creature is so great, that although reasonable creatures do owe obedience unto Him as their Creator, yet they could never have *any fruition of Him as their blessedness and reward*, but by some voluntary condescension on God's part, which He has been pleased to express by way of covenant.' *The Savoy Declaration* changes the above italicised words to: attained the reward of life. It appears that the *Savoy* leaves the reward less defined than the *Westminster*.

⁴⁶ For example, John Calvin writes: 'His earthly life truly would have been temporal; yet he would have passed into heaven without death, and without injury.' *Genesis*, Vol. 1, 127. Francis Turretin holds that obedience would result in an eternal and heavenly life. 'Rather the question is whether that happiness and life were to be passed in heaven or only upon the earth and in paradise. The latter, they affirm; we the former.' *Institutes*, Vol. 1, 583.

Goodwin reveals his hand very early in his discussion of the state of Adam before the fall. His design in addressing this issue is

to magnify the supercreation grace of God in election, and the glory of Christ as our head and a Saviour, which was revealed upon our fallen condition, though ordained afore all worlds.⁴⁷

When he goes on to say that it is not only humanity's fall that exalts supernatural grace 'but even our first original and best state that preceded it,'⁴⁸ he indicates his trajectory in this matter.

Goodwin argues that once God had freely chosen to make a creature with reason and understanding, it was proper that God should be the object of these natural capacities. Through these natural gifts 'God was to be both known and enjoyed by man.'⁴⁹ 'Natural happiness' in God was Adam's 'natural due' and it was fitting for God to continue to grant these natural gifts with the consequent communion with God so long as Adam remained obedient. Anything over and above these natural gifts with a consequent deeper communion with God⁵⁰ was 'supernatural, and is therefore called grace, as being a free gift over and above that which was necessarily due to such a creature.'⁵¹

Confirmation in the state of innocence, on the other hand, was not a natural due because mutability is the nature of a creature; only God is immutable. Therefore, 'for God

⁴⁷ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:22.

⁴⁸ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:22.

⁴⁹ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:44.

⁵⁰ Goodwin provides a scheme of the several states of humanity, both as unfallen and redeemed in relation to their communion with God. The first, the state of Adam in innocence, the second, the state of grace sinners experience through Christ, the third, the state of glory. This last state has, Goodwin writes, three degrees: (i) souls of believers upon their death; (ii) the state of believers upon the resurrection when soul and body are rejoined; (iii) the state of believers when Christ gives up his kingdom to the Father. It is important to note that Goodwin's understanding of the communion with God which Adam enjoyed in the Garden was of a lesser degree than the communion which the redeemed have while on earth, which, in turn, is less vigorous than the communion which the saints have in glory. See *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:38. There is no communion with God in the state of sinfulness.

⁵¹ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:44. It is helpful to mention Goodwin's notion of grace. '[G]race is not to be limited, or only understood of the favour towards the creatures that have sinned.' *Of Election, Works* 9:95. Rather, 'whatsoever is above the dues of creation, and the rules thereof, is grace, and as truly such as that which is called mercy, as shewn to a sinner or creature actually fallen, is called grace.' *Of Election, Works* 9:5.

to have ever confirmed man whom he thus made in that goodness, . . . had been a supernatural grace, because it is more than is due to any creature as reasonable.’⁵²

The import of this with regard to the question of Adam’s reward is this: since heaven and its consequent beatific vision are beyond what is man’s natural due, Adam could not have merited it by his obedience because ‘[g]race and works, we read in the words of Rom. xi.6, are so opposed, as those which intermingle not.’⁵³ Goodwin goes on to write:

A perfect holiness, and a stronger holiness than man’s was their due by creation, but to be kept by so strong an assistance as should effectually fix their wills, and for ever after keep them so, this was above ordinary creation-law, and so above the law of works.⁵⁴

The reward for obedience under the covenant of nature

was but the continuance of the same happy life which he enjoyed in paradise, together with God’s favour towards him . . . and not translating him, in the end, unto the spiritual life in heaven, which the angels have, and which the saints shall have.⁵⁵

Goodwin emphatically writes:

Adam could not earn a condition of a higher rank, nor by all his works have bought any greater preferment than what he was created in. To compass it was *ultra suam sphaeram*, above his sphere; he could never have done it.⁵⁶

There is also a Christological principle that undergirds Goodwin’s insistence on Adam’s inability to gain heaven by his obedience. In this context, Goodwin elaborates on the comparison of Adam and Christ that Paul addresses in 1 Corinthians 15:44-49, particularly the contrasts between the first man as a ‘living soul,’ ‘natural,’ and ‘earthly,’ and the second man as a ‘quickening spirit,’ ‘spiritual,’ and ‘heavenly.’

Adam’s ‘reasonable soul [became] a principle of life to a body created out of the earth, and ordained to live in the earth.’⁵⁷ Christ, on the other hand, is the Godhead ‘or

⁵² *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:45.

⁵³ *Of Election*, Works 9:5. Later in the volume Goodwin writes: ‘And this ultimate glory, the kingdom of the Father, and God being all in all, should never have gone by works only, which was Adam’s covenant.’ *Of Election*, Works 9:158.

⁵⁴ *Of Election*, Works 9:5.

⁵⁵ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:49.

⁵⁶ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:82-83.

⁵⁷ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:80.

Spirit⁵⁸ quickening a human nature, ordained to live in heaven.⁵⁹ Adam is the union of body and soul for life on earth; Christ is the hypostatic union of divine and human natures for life in heaven.

Goodwin insists that God's intention in Genesis was 'to make that first Adam a type therein of Christ, a second Adam.'⁶⁰ Drawing on this typology then, Goodwin proceeds to say that Adam, as a living soul, conveyed an embodied soul existence to his posterity suited for life on earth. The antitype, Christ, who is a quickening Spirit, was able 'to quicken, raise, or advance our earthly bodies, which we received from Adam, unto a spiritual and heavenly condition.'⁶¹

In this connection, '[t]hat paradise that Adam enjoyed was but the type of paradise above.'⁶² Therefore, as Adam would have passed that earthly paradise to his posterity had he remained obedient, Christ passes the heavenly paradise to his elect. The first Adam, who is of the earth, could never have done this. 'So that, take away the second Adam that was to come, and there had been no second paradise for Adam to come to.'⁶³ 'Christ was the first and only author of that heavenly life which the saints in heaven do enjoy, and he himself coming from heaven he carries us thither.'⁶⁴

In terms of Goodwin's Christology it is important to note the way he employs Adam as a type to explain both Christ's personal and mediatorial glory. Adam, postlapsarian, is a type of Christ vis-a-vis his work of redemption. Paul uses this Adam/Christ, type/antitype in Romans 5. But in terms of Christ conveying to us the heavenly life, Goodwin states that this is the antitype of Adam in his prelapsarian innocence. 'But then, in that other work, his bestowing upon us that spiritual and heavenly condition of life, in a conformity to his own

⁵⁸ Goodwin understands Spirit here, not as the third person of the Trinity, but as the divine essence. Similarly, Goodwin writes about Heb 9:14, "And therefore the apostle, ver. 14, having shewed how Christ 'by the eternal Spirit offered up himself' (that is, by his Godhead, &c.)." *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:38.

⁵⁹ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:78.

⁶⁰ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:82.

⁶¹ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:80.

⁶² *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:50.

⁶³ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:50.

⁶⁴ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:49.

personal glory, . . . in this, Christ had for his type Adam's estate and condition before his fall.'⁶⁵

This means that for Goodwin, the elect's translation to glory depends not so much on Christ's death but on his person.

Yea, and the apostle doth put our carrying to heaven, as he there argues it, not so much upon the merit of Christ's death, as upon his being 'the Lord from heaven,' because heaven was his natural due, and he descended from his right when he came down upon the earth.⁶⁶

[T]he apostle doth here [in 1 Corinthians 15] found that heavenly estate of ours to come merely upon that glory due to Christ, as the Lord from heaven, and this upon the sole and single consideration of the personal union of that human nature with the Godhead, and therein ordained a common person to us.⁶⁷

Goodwin's intention is not to diminish the importance of Christ's mediatorial work but to put it in its proper place relative to the person of Christ. The work of Christ was to remove 'the impediment [to] this their first intended glory.'⁶⁸ For Goodwin, Christ's personal glory is chief. Even an unfallen Adam required a God-man to bring him to the eternal state of glory.

Christ's Work as an 'After' Plot to God's first design

We have already intimated in this chapter that Goodwin considers the mediatorial work of Christ subordinate to the person of Christ. He designates Christ's work as an 'after plot'⁶⁹ to God's first design for elect humanity. This primacy of the person of Christ to the work of Christ, is also clearly seen in his discussion of grace in his work on Ephesians 1:4-9.⁷⁰

Goodwin notes that the spiritual blessings the elect have in Christ are not all of the same order. He points out that these verses can be viewed as a trichotomy highlighting the

⁶⁵ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:87.

⁶⁶ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:50.

⁶⁷ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:87.

⁶⁸ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:87.

⁶⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:118.

⁷⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:65-147.

work of each person of the Trinity,⁷¹ but he prefers to speak of a dichotomy, with ‘one sort of blessings from the 4th verse to the 7th, and another sort of blessings from the 7th verse to the 10th.’⁷² Paul’s change of tense prompts Goodwin to distinguish the blessings.

The Apostle here changeth the key of his language: ‘He hath chosen, he hath blessed, he hath accepted.’ This was his language before; but here he beginneth to alter it. Here he varies the tense, and says, ‘In whom we have redemption,’ & c. Because he comes to a new sort of blessings, therefore he speaks in a new key.

What is the difference between the categories of blessings? Some are *superlapsarian*; others are *sublapsarian*.

The *superlapsarian* blessings are holiness, adoption, and acceptance. These blessings were God’s first intention for the elect as considered unfallen and could have been conferred even if humanity had not sinned. Furthermore, they are not grounded on Christ’s mediatorial labours even after humanity sinned.

This can be illustrated by following a dialogue Goodwin crafts regarding adoption.

Now, how is this being adopted through him to be understood? Of being made sons through his merits, or through the mere relation to his person? I answer, through the relation to his person and Christ’s being a Son. . . . [A]doption . . . was not founded upon redemption, or Christ’s obedience, but on Christ’s personally being God’s natural Son.⁷³

Similarly, our acceptance in the beloved is one of ‘other *antelapsarian* benefits, severed from those of redemption . . .; that is, as flowing to us from Christ as our head of union with God; and to us as considered as purely creatures and abstractly before sin befell us.’⁷⁴

Goodwin claims that these three blessings are ‘absolutely pitched upon our persons in the relation we have to the person of Christ. . . . All these three blessings are not founded so much upon the merits of Christ, as upon the relation we have unto his person.’⁷⁵

⁷¹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:113.

⁷² *Ephesians, Works* 1:114.

⁷³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:96.

⁷⁴ *Ephesians, Works* 1:110.

⁷⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:113.

What about the *sublapsarian* blessings of redemption, justification, and vocation which Goodwin finds enumerated in verses 7-9? '[T]hese are three other blessings, founded upon our relation to Christ through his *merits*.'⁷⁶

Both the *superlapsarian* and *sublapsarian* blessings have things in common: they both originate in God's eternal decrees, are the expression of free grace, and are in Christ. The first sort, the *superlapsarian*, refer to the end to which God has 'ordained us unto;' the *sublapsarian* sort refers to the 'way through which God leads us in bringing us to that end.'⁷⁷

The elect's eternal blessing did not depend on the merits of Christ except upon consideration of the fall which God permitted to happen. Christ's work was remedial, to restore to the elect, now fallen, what they had virtually because of union with Christ the head. Goodwin writes in connection with adoption, 'Only let me add this caution, that we have indeed lost all our privileges, Christ was fain to purchase them anew.'⁷⁸ That is, if Christ had not procured redemption by his death, the elect would not have received adoption. '[Y]et still intended it was, and founded upon our relation to Christ's person as he is God's natural Son . . . [a]nd so, when sins are by his merits done out of the way, then this comes to take place.'⁷⁹ As he states elsewhere, Christ's work 'was to recover us out of those evils that fell out by the way, unto that dignity which God in Christ first chose us unto.'⁸⁰

These *superlapsarian* blessings are 'more glorious' than *sublapsarian* blessings and 'our very relation to his person . . . continue[s] to be the main foundation . . . of our right unto those blessings.'⁸¹

⁷⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:114 (emphasis original).

⁷⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 1:115.

⁷⁸ *Ephesians, Works* 1:96.

⁷⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:96-97.

⁸⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:122.

⁸¹ *Knowledge, Works* 4:537.

Goodwin's elevation of the person of Christ over his work can be observed in this comment in the context of the double gift of Christ to his elect, both as Head and Saviour, where he writes: 'whereof the gift of him as of a Redeemer to us is of the two the least.'⁸²

Christ and his Mediatorial Kingdom

We can also gain some insight into Goodwin's understanding of the priority of Christ's personal glory by looking at what he says regarding Christ's mediatorial or dispensatory kingdom.

To do this it is helpful to look at his reflection on Ephesians 1:21 and God's exaltation of Christ 'not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.' Goodwin makes a distinction between the dominion that Christ has as he is God, and by extension, what he by natural inheritance has as the God-man, on the one hand, and the reign he exercises as the Mediator between God and his Church on the other.

Concerning the first, which Goodwin calls a 'natural kingdom'⁸³ Christ has a right to this because he is the eternal Son of God and, further, this right devolves upon him as God-man by inheritance. In this kingdom he shares the rule of all things with the Father, though the Father remains greater than he on account of Christ's appointment as the God-man. This kingdom and these honours are part of his inherent glory and not acquired by Christ by his work on earth, though they are granted to him following his work on earth.⁸⁴

Goodwin also speaks of a second kingdom which he calls a '*dispensatory kingdom*'⁸⁵ which belongs to Christ as the mediator between God and his Church and which is temporary. 'God gave it to him as a reward of his obedience; he hath it by commission.'⁸⁶ In this capacity, which he received after his resurrection and ascension,⁸⁷ he rules on behalf of his Father until 'the day of judgment.'⁸⁸

⁸² *Ephesians, Works* 1:121.

⁸³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:502.

⁸⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:496.

⁸⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:503 (emphasis original).

⁸⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:503.

⁸⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 1:477.

⁸⁸ *Ephesians, Works* 1:503.

Goodwin acknowledges the axiom *opera Trinitatis ad extra indivisa sunt* but notes that ‘though the Father ruleth all till the day of judgment, and the Holy Ghost with him, yet it is in a more especial manner appropriated unto the Son.’⁸⁹ He goes on to say that this specific appropriation is an act of God’s will and so it is possible that an action is attributed to one person for a while and then to another.

So now until the day of judgment Christ hath the kingdom committed to him; after the day of judgment it is appropriated more eminently unto God the Father, yet so as that God the Father ruleth now; so on the other side, though the Father is all in all after the day of judgment, yet the Son is said still to judge.⁹⁰

Why would the Father withdraw himself from visibly ruling ‘the affairs of the world?’⁹¹ It is for the Son’s glory, ‘that all men should honour the Son as they honour the Father’ (John 5:22). He is assigned this glory as a reward ‘because he veiled his Godhead in obedience to his Father’⁹² in his humiliation. After the day of judgment, however, the Son reciprocates the Father’s honouring of him and ‘Jesus Christ, to honour his Father, give[s] up the kingdom to him, and he himself becometh subject to him that hath put all things under him.’⁹³ This giving up the kingdom to his Father after the final judgement and every knee has bowed to him, ‘is the last and great solemnity of all’⁹⁴ before the eternal state commences.

Goodwin introduces another distinction when he discusses the mediatory kingdom of Jesus Christ that highlights its temporary nature. He speaks of Christ’s mediatorial relationship to the Church in two ways.⁹⁵

⁸⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:503.

⁹⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:503.

⁹¹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:476.

⁹² *Ephesians, Works* 1:503. See also where Goodwin records the Father saying to the Son, ‘Have you obscured your glory, saith he, withdrawn it for my sake? I will do as much for you, I will commit all judgment to you; I will not be seen, the eyes and thoughts of all creatures shall be next upon you.’ *Ephesians, Works* 1:476. ‘Because that he glorified God in suffering himself to be made obedient to the death, therefore it was justice for God to glorify him likewise.’ *Ephesians, Works* 1:476.

⁹³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:504.

⁹⁴ *Ephesians, Works* 1:504.

⁹⁵ As Head of the elect and as their Saviour. Usually, when speaking of Christ as the Saviour of the elect he refers to the mediatorial work of the Lord Jesus. On the occasions when he is referring to Christ as the head of the elect he refers to his person as Mediator. For example, he speaks of the God-man as a ‘mediator or head of union’ to the elect abstractly considered apart from his work. In the next paragraph Goodwin speaks of Christ’s ‘mediatory glory’, referring to his work of redemption for the saints. See *Knowledge, Works* 4:508. In another place he also speaks of Christ’s office of mediatorship in two ways,

First, Christ is the mediator of his Church as her Saviour. In this context, the Church is ‘*considered under imperfection*, either of sin or misery, or any other want, till his Church shall be complete.’⁹⁶ This state of the Church lasts until the final judgement when the Church is finally ‘out of all danger.’⁹⁷ As long as the Church is not yet fully glorified Christ reigns as a mediator for them to God. He rules ‘in a way of conquest, destroying sin and death and all enemies, and redeeming the body, and bringing body and soul together, and lastly pronouncing a final sentence.’⁹⁸ When ‘this final sentence is passed, then this work of a Mediator, his reigning thus as a Redeemer of us considered under sin and misery, ceaseth.’⁹⁹

From then on God ‘looks upon us as in his first project.’¹⁰⁰ This comment is connected to the other relationship Christ has to the Church as mediator, that is, as a head which was discussed above. In eternity Christ’s relationship to the Church as head continues. Goodwin writes: ‘We were chosen in him at first . . . and as we were chosen in him at first, so we are considered in him for ever, and exalted in him, our persons in his Person.’¹⁰¹ What is first in intention is last in execution.

The following lengthy quotation from Goodwin will show in which ways Christ’s glory ends and continues.

For after the work of mediation for us as sinners is fully over, and every way perfected, and the day of judgment ended; when sins shall finally be forgiven, and then for ever forgotten, as the promise intended, Christ will give up his mediatory kingdom and glory to his Father; and then that *regnum antemundanum*, that kingdom afore, and abstracted from the consideration of this world, or what we were, or Christ as Redeemer for us therein, shall for ever predominantly take place, when God, in the Father, Son, and Spirit, shall be all in all to him as God-man as well as us; and when Christ the Son, having laid down only the economy of his mediation as a Redeemer, shall yet in his person, as he shall appear with the fulness of the Godhead dwelling bodily in him, and the brightness of the glory of God shining in the human nature, which he can never lay down, or divest himself of, shall be as he is, and was constituted, an head, an husband unto us; and we chosen as fellows and companions

first, of Christ’s ‘relation unto us, and for us, and from what he did or wrought for us as sinners.’
Knowledge, Works 4:493.

⁹⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:504 (emphasis original).

⁹⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 1:504.

⁹⁸ *Ephesians, Works* 1:505.

⁹⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:505.

¹⁰⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:505.

¹⁰¹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:505.

with him, be the object and efficient of our happiness for ever, by our beholding that his glory, according to that of John xvii. 24 (I opened): ‘Father, I will that they also whom thou hast given me be with me where I am, that they may behold my glory which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world.’ And after the day of judgment ended, it is whereof the apostle speaks, when he says, ‘We shall be ever with the Lord,’ 1 Thes. iv. 17.¹⁰²

Clearly the personal glory of Christ eclipses the glory of his mediatorial work which is most prominent during Christ’s dispensatory or mediatorial kingdom.

The Beatific Vision

Following from the above discussion of the temporariness of the mediatorial kingdom of the God-man, Goodwin’s conception of the beatific vision further underscores that Christ’s personal glory, as abstracted from his mediatorial glory, is chief in his Christology.

Goodwin’s understanding of the beatific vision was hinted at in the section above which treated his perspective on Christ’s mediatorial kingdom. What will the saints view in heaven after the day of judgement and the laying down of Christ’s mediatorial kingdom? Clearly, in answer to Christ’s prayer in John 17:24 it is beholding the glory of Christ. But what aspects or dimensions of Christ’s threefold glory will they view? There are a number of ways to approach Goodwin’s thought on this matter.

First, we see the priority of Christ’s person over his work in Goodwin’s discussion of what constitutes perfect love. In his comments on Ephesians 1:3 he postulates that we are to bless God ‘*out of goodwill to God himself*; that is, purely for what he is himself, and not only for what to ourselves.’¹⁰³ Although we also bless him for the blessings we receive ‘yet it must rise higher in the end, (and in heaven it will do so,) even purely to bless him for himself, or else we love him not, nor bless him, as the great God is to be loved and blessed by us.’¹⁰⁴ The highest strains of grace in the elect are demonstrated, Goodwin states, in that they

glorify God for himself, and their own happiness they consider not; for it is but a result or consequent of their joying in the amplitude of God’s glory which they are

¹⁰² *Of Election, Works* 9:99.

¹⁰³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:28 (emphasis original).

¹⁰⁴ *Ephesians, Works* 1:28.

wholly swallowed up into; for God becomes ‘all in all’ in them and to them, 1 Cor. xv. 28.¹⁰⁵

Goodwin applies this thought to the second person of the Trinity encouraging us to be imitators of God. Why does the Father love the Son? ‘God cannot love him for any benefit of redemption by him; and yet he is God’s beloved. He is *primum amabile*, loved for himself, and so let him be to thee.’¹⁰⁶ Goodwin states that ‘the knowledge of Christ, and communion with his person and the glory thereof, is part of the happiness ordained for us in the world to come.’ Though only a part of the elect’s happiness, it is evident that it is the primary part and a part which eclipses ‘the knowledge of Christ in his benefits of redemption.’¹⁰⁷

Secondly, that the saints should behold Christ’s personal glory is the Father’s answer to Christ’s prayer in John 17:24 according to Goodwin. It has been shown earlier that Goodwin understands Christ’s prayer in John 17:5 to be a request for the return of the glory of having the fullness of the Godhead dwelling in the God-man. This glory is what he prays in verse 24 that the elect would see, namely, the sight of Christ, God-man. When the eternal state dawns

then will the person of Christ, God-man, as the glory of the Godhead, shining and communicating itself to us, through that human nature the Godhead dwells in, be set forth to us, to entertain us for ever with the sight of the glory of God in the face of Christ. . . . And that face will make a heaven to us when redemption shall be forgotten, through the present glory viewed and possessed, and sins remembered no more; but the glory of God, and the personal glory of the Lamb, shall be our light and happiness for ever.¹⁰⁸

Thirdly, Goodwin employs the Old Testament tabernacle imagery to support his insistence on the primacy of Christ’s personal glory. The ark made of plain wood covered with gold ‘typed forth his very person, simply considered. . . . The wood signified his humanity, the gold his divine nature, as joined both in one.’¹⁰⁹ And this ark resided in the

¹⁰⁵ *Knowledge, Works* 4:383.

¹⁰⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:112.

¹⁰⁷ *Ephesians, Works* 1:122.

¹⁰⁸ *Knowledge, Works* 4:565-566.

¹⁰⁹ *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:435.

holy of holies and ‘is termed the glory and beauty of God’ just as Christ’s person is declared by Simeon to be ‘the glory of thy people Israel.’¹¹⁰

Additionally, the high priest also represents Christ, his person and work. And yet, when the high priest entered the holy of holies, he went in dressed in the simple linen garment, without his ‘gaudy robes.’ ‘And it typifies this out, that Christ’s personal glory is that with which in the holy of holies he shall most eminently, and above all others, appear for ever in, and sit down in it.’¹¹¹

The perfection of glory, which the elect shall reach, is to enter the holy of holies and behold the ark. Goodwin euphonically states, ‘Oh how will men then more continually rejoice in the contemplation of his person, and above all, love him, value him for what he is in himself, and for himself.’¹¹²

Conclusion

It has now been shown from a variety of perspectives that Goodwin elevates the personal glory of the God-man above his mediatorial glory and his person above his work. He is able to do so, in part, because he conceives of Christ receiving his personal glory in two stages: (i) At his appointment to and acceptance of the office of God-man, and, (ii) at the actual incarnation. This, in turn, enables Goodwin to posit Christ having a relationship with the elect apart from his mediatorial work on their behalf. Christ is the head of the elect (considered as unfallen) before he becomes the Saviour of the same elect (considered as fallen). The primacy of Christ as head of the elect and their relation to his Person in eternity past, as God’s first design regarding the elect, also become the primary focus in eternity future when the elect will gaze on the personal glory of the God-man, as abstracted from his mediatorial glory.

In our final chapter, to which we now turn, we will explore what contributes to this bifurcation of the person and work of Christ and examine whether the teaching of Scripture (Goodwin’s own self-confessed standard) warrants this bifurcation.

¹¹⁰ *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:435.

¹¹¹ *Knowledge*, Works 4:499.

¹¹² *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:436.

5. An Analysis and Critique of Goodwin's Christology

As we approach our final analysis and critique of Goodwin's proposal of the threefold glory of Christ it is helpful to have his schema in mind.

1. The three persons of the Godhead, delighting in their blessed companionship, desire to share their experience with humanity.

Under this rubric Goodwin discusses the essential glory of the second person of the Trinity.¹

2. From eternity the second person has been constituted the God-man, a middle person between the elect and God, 'whom [God] would make visibly glorious in a human nature.'² The elect, chosen out of a *massa pura*, are chosen in Christ, that is, when Christ is chosen as the head, they are chosen along with him. We note here Goodwin's Christocentric supralapsarianism.³ It is supralapsarian because the decree of election is antecedent to the decree to permit the fall and it is Christocentric because Christ was chosen as God-man primarily for his own glory.

Under this heading Goodwin discusses the personal glory of the second person of the Trinity.⁴

3. Then, to increase the glory of the God-man, humanity was ordained to fall into sin. Having determined that they should be redeemed by a mediator necessitated that the God-man, the head of the elect, should also become their Redeemer and clear away the obstacles sin erected to their union and communion with God through Christ their head. Following his incarnation and mediatorial work, Christ ascends to

¹ Discussed in Chapter 1 above, 6-14.

² *Ephesians, Works* 1:98.

³ See 'Thomas Goodwin's Christological Supralapsarianism.' *A Puritan Theology*, 149-159. To call Goodwin's supralapsarianism Christocentric is more nuanced than to call it Christological as it highlights that Christ and his glory is the first and centre of God's decrees concerning humanity. As we have seen, Goodwin's supralapsarianism extends only as to the end of God's decrees and does not include the creation and fall of Adam as means to the end. Humanity is presupposed as fallen with regard to the means to accomplish that end. Since this chapter primarily treats of Christ's personal glory we will speak of Goodwin's supralapsarianism while remembering that he distinguishes his position from that of the 'pure superlapsarian' *Of Election, Works* 9:84. See above, 52-57.

⁴ Discussed in Chapter 3 above, 37-50.

heaven as the victorious Redeemer of God's elect and reigns at the right hand of the Father until all his enemies become a stool for his feet and the final judgement is pronounced. Thereupon Christ hands over his mediatorial kingdom to the Father and becomes subject to him. The saints behold the glory of Christ, both his personal and mediatorial glory, until the end of Christ's mediatorial kingdom.

This suffering and subsequent glory of the God-man Goodwin discusses as the mediatorial glory of the second person of the Trinity.⁵

4. After the mediatorial kingdom has come to an end and for all eternity the elect enjoy union and communion with the Trinity through their union with Christ, the head of the elect, and by gazing exclusively on the personal glory of the God-man.⁶

What has been demonstrated in our earlier exposition is that Goodwin's Christology bears a distinctive characteristic. While others, along with Goodwin, speak of the essential, personal, and mediatorial glory of Christ, in Goodwin's proposal, there is a hard distinction between the double glory of the God-man, his personal and mediatorial glory. As a result Goodwin is able to theologise about the personal glory of the God-man *apart from his mediatorial glory*. Furthermore, this personal glory is the centre of his Christology, the most significant glory of the second person of the Trinity.

This raises for us two questions: (i) What contributes to Goodwin's positing the double glory of the God-man in this way, and, (ii) does the Scripture bifurcate the person and work of Christ the way Goodwin does?

The contention of this analysis is that Goodwin's thinking tends to become speculative at certain points in his Christology and that this results in a bifurcation of the person and work of Christ. This bifurcation, therefore, lacks Scriptural warrant. This will be demonstrated, first, by situating Goodwin within the broader theological tradition. The parallels between the Scotist position on the reason for the incarnation and Goodwin's will be pointed out, followed by a survey of the critique of Scotus explicitly (and therefore

⁵ Discussed in Chapter 2 above, 15-36.

⁶ Discussed in Chapter 4 above, 51-69.

Goodwin implicitly) found in the work of two major theologians within Goodwin's own tradition, namely, John Calvin and John Owen.

Then, building on Calvin's and Owen's critique of the Scotist theory we will discuss Goodwin's application to his Christology of the classical Reformed hermeneutical principle of good and necessary consequence.

Finally, the usefulness of Goodwin's Christology, both theologically and pastorally, will be assessed by engaging the question, 'Does Goodwin's commitment to the predestination of the God-man absolutely considered render a deathblow to his Christology?'

Reasons for the Incarnation within the Theological Tradition

To assess and critique Goodwin's Christology it will be beneficial to return to the hypothetical question whether the incarnation would have occurred had man not fallen. Or, to pose the question positively, why did God ordain the second person of the Trinity to be the God-man? Surveying the answers given to this question will help to situate Goodwin within the broader theological tradition relative to the question and enable us to probe both his Christology and his hermeneutic.

Scotus and the Incarnation

Goodwin was familiar with the medieval scholastic tradition.⁷ His son writes that Goodwin 'read much . . . [including] among the school-men.'⁸ Here, investigating the Medieval Scholastic, John Duns Scotus, proves particularly fruitful.

Scotus's name does not appear in the index in Goodwin's *Works* but there are at least four references to him,⁹ and he describes him as 'the wisest of [the school-men].'¹⁰

⁷ References to schoolmen such as Alexander of Hales (1185-1245), Bonaventure (1221-74), Aquinas (1225-74), Scotus (1266-1308), Gerard (d. 1317), Estius (1542-1613), and Suarez (1548-1617) are scattered throughout his corpus.

⁸ *Memoir, Works*, 2:1xxiii. Mark Jones comments: 'That his theology exhibits scholastic traits is obvious. A number of references in Goodwin's commentary on Ephesians makes his familiarity with the scholastics clear.' *Why Heaven Kissed Earth*, 65. Blackham writes more specifically: 'It seems fairly likely that he had read, carefully, the work of Duns Scotus.' *Pneumatology*, 154.

⁹ *Ephesians, Works* 2:272; *Glory of the Gospel, Works* 4:239; *Christ the Mediator, Works* 5:279; *Of Election, Works* 9:92.

¹⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 2:272.

Although Goodwin never designates Scotus's Christology as an influence on his own, it is not difficult to hear the echoes of him in Goodwin's work.¹¹ Scotus's insistence that the incarnation should not be thought of primarily as a response to the fall parallels Goodwin's formulation of the personal glory of Christ.

Goodwin and the Incarnation

When, in his exposition of Ephesians, Goodwin entertains the hypothetical question of what would have happened if humanity had not fallen, he writes that he does not, and dares not, affirm that Christ would have become incarnate 'because all things are ordained to fall out no otherwise than they do.'¹² He considers questions of that nature 'a chimera and fiction.'¹³

However, that is not Goodwin's only comment on the issue. In his discussion of the relationship between Adam and Christ, as type and antitype respectively, in *Of the Creatures, and the Condition of their State by Creation*,¹⁴ he states that Adam in his prelapsarian state was 'intended by God to foreshadow Christ to come and assume an human nature.'¹⁵ Goodwin goes on to state that though in the course of events Christ actually did take human likeness and frail humanity, being born of a woman, 'yet in God's primary intention, his chief and primary decree, his eye and first aim was at his Son's having such a state and condition in his human nature as he hath now in heaven glorified.'¹⁶ Had there been no fall, the incarnation would have taken place in some other (undesigned) way. As Goodwin says elsewhere, Christ's due as God-man, 'was to have had a glorified nature, such as now he hath in heaven.'¹⁷

¹¹ See above, 16-17.

¹² *Ephesians*, Works 1:99.

¹³ *Ephesians*, Works 1:99.

¹⁴ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:1-128.

¹⁵ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:74.

¹⁶ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:74.

¹⁷ *Knowledge*, Works 4:559. John Owen comments in opposition to this view that Christ 'is not called the first, or the exemplar of the creation of men, but the *second* Adam, 1 Corinthians 15:47, being to recover and restore what was lost by the first.' Works, Vol. 18:36.

Why is Goodwin unwilling to affirm in one place, and even dares not affirm,¹⁸ that Christ would have become incarnate had humanity not fallen, and yet elsewhere¹⁹ describes what Christ's humanity would have looked like if there had been no fall?

One possible explanation, of course, is that there was development in Goodwin's thought. Carter, relying heavily on Lawrence's dating of Goodwin's materials, notes that Goodwin's exposition of Ephesians 1²⁰ took place in the 1640s after his return from the Netherlands. His later work, *Of the Creatures*²¹ was sermons preached in the 1650s while he was at Oxford.²² Perhaps his commitment to the principle, 'First in intention, last in execution,' solidified in the intervening years, and as a result he addressed more directly what would have happened had Adam not fallen.

Whatever the reason for jettisoning his earlier reticence to speak to the hypothetical question, Goodwin's conviction that Christ's incarnation was not chiefly for human redemption but for the glory of the God-man appears repeatedly throughout his corpus wherever he discusses the reason for the incarnation.

Calvin and the Incarnation

It is clear that Goodwin had read Calvin and references to him are dispersed throughout his corpus. He refers to him as 'holy and most judicious'²³ and as 'a man of so great a judgment.'²⁴ Nevertheless, despite Calvin's strong arguments against Scotist thought with regard to the predestination of the God-man absolutely considered, Scotus's Christological views are significantly echoed in Goodwin. This fact makes Calvin's interaction with the hypothetical question important for our assessment and critique of Goodwin.

¹⁸ *Ephesians*, Works 1:99.

¹⁹ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:74 and *Knowledge*, Works 4:559.

²⁰ *Ephesians*, Works 1:1-564.

²¹ *Of the Creatures*, Works 7:1-128.

²² Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, Appendix B: Dating of Select Treatises from Goodwin's *Works*, 357-370.

²³ *Of the Blessed State*, Works 7:358.

²⁴ *Of Election*, Works 9:93.

There are divergent views on the relationship between Scotus and Calvin. Paul Helm suggests there is no ‘hard evidence that Calvin actually read Scotus’²⁵ while Derek Thomas affirms that Calvin’s view on the necessity of the atonement ‘reflects Calvin’s voluntarism and a dependence on the views of Duns Scotus.’²⁶ There is what Thomas terms ‘[t]he problematic statement’²⁷ in Calvin, ‘Even if man had remained free from all stain, his condition would have been too lowly for him to reach God without a Mediator.’²⁸ Calvin, however, does not linger long on that hypothesis but immediately speaks of humanity ‘plunged by his mortal ruin into death and hell’²⁹ and therefore needing a redemptive mediator. The human need for redemption is the soil in which Calvin plants the incarnation. He rejects ‘the vague speculations that captivate the frivolous and the seekers after novelty’ particularly the speculation that ‘Christ would still have become man even if no means of redeeming mankind had been needed.’³⁰ Calvin does not suggest that the fall of Adam is to be presupposed as the reason for the predestination of Christ as Head and Redeemer.³¹ But he is unwilling to go beyond the explicit statements of the Scriptures.

It is quite enough for me to say that all those who propose to inquire or seek to know more about Christ than God ordained by his secret decree are breaking out in impious boldness to fashion some new sort of Christ.³²

Thus for Calvin the issue is not whether the Scriptures *refute* the view held by Osiander³³ that Christ would have taken human form if Adam had not fallen.³⁴ The proper question is, rather, what do the Scriptures *positively teach*? On this basis, for Calvin the

²⁵ Helm, *Calvin's Ideas*, 342.

²⁶ Thomas, *A Theological Guide*, 209.

²⁷ Thomas, *A Theological Guide*, 209.

²⁸ John Calvin, *Institutes*, 2.12.1. John Owen states that even if the angels and men had persisted in their sinlessness the Son of God would ‘have been the immediate head and ruler of angels and men . . . for the representation of God unto them, as the cause and end of their being, the object and end of their worship and service, should have been in and by his person, as the image of the Father, and by and through him they should have received all the communications of God unto them.’ *Works*, Vol. 18:34. Here Owen seems to capture Calvin’s intention. Where he differs from Goodwin is that Owen sees this as being true of the Son of God in his pre-incarnate state, essentially considered, that is, the Son of God ‘was the essential and eternal image of the Father antecedent unto all consideration of his incarnation.’ *Works*, Vol. 18:33.

²⁹ *Institutes*, 2.12.1.

³⁰ *Institutes*, 2.12.4.

³¹ *Institutes*, 2.12.5.

³² *Institutes*, 2.12.5.

³³ Andreas Osiander (1498-1552) was a German Lutheran theologian.

³⁴ *Institutes*, 2.12.5

person and work of Christ must never be bifurcated. '[W]henver Christ is mentioned we should not in the least depart from the grace of reconciliation.'³⁵ 'In short, the only reason given in Scripture that the Son of God willed to take our flesh . . . is that he would be a sacrifice to appease the Father on our behalf.'³⁶ Calvin insists that the Word of God limits our theological positions. For that reason he does not present the predestination of Christ as God-man without the consideration of the fall into sin.

This is also seen in his discussion of predestination. While willing to posit that 'predestination to glory is the cause of predestination to grace' he bids 'farewell to these contentions, as they are superfluous among those who consider that there is enough wisdom for them in the Word of God.'³⁷ Again, one sees a reticence in Calvin to contend about matters the Word of God does not specifically address.

Owen and the Incarnation

What is particularly noteworthy is that this same discretion is seen in John Owen, Goodwin's friend and colleague at Oxford University. Historians of the period would give a great deal to discover an account of discussion between the two 'Atlases of Independency' but none exists. Although Owen disagrees with Goodwin's position on whether the incarnation would have occurred had humans not fallen, he never mentions his colleague by name in this context. It remains therefore an open question whether he had Goodwin specifically in view.

Owen's engagement with the question is found in his *Exercitations on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, particularly Exercitation XXVI where he addresses the origin of the priesthood of Christ.³⁸ He begins by stating that the priesthood of Christ was not ordained by God with respect to man in the state of innocency thus linking Christ's priesthood with human sinfulness. He opposes the view, first by referring to those Schoolmen, including Scotus, who, while acknowledging the pre-existence of the Son of God also affirm that the incarnation would have happened had sin not entered the world.³⁹ Those were opposed by,

³⁵ *Institutes*, 2.12.5.

³⁶ *Institutes*, 2.12.4.

³⁷ *Institutes*, 3.22.9.

³⁸ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:14-42.

³⁹ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:21.

among others, Aquinas.⁴⁰ He further mentions that Osiander revived this position but was opposed by Calvin, among others. He then takes up the Socinians before returning to interact with the view of the Schoolmen and Osiander.

Owen feels the need to refute this position, although it had already been refuted by others, because ‘some are still of this judgment, or seem to be.’⁴¹ Without citing Goodwin, he summarises the very view held by Goodwin on the person of the God-man considered apart from his mediatorial work. He concludes that to posit an incarnation without respect to redemption is both ‘*unwritten. . . contrary to what is written, . . . and . . . destitute of any solid spiritual reason* for the confirmation of it.’⁴²

To speak of the second person taking humanity to himself without respect to sin is, Owen says, grounded on ‘neither argument nor testimony but conjecture and curiosity.’⁴³ It is to create a theological formulation that is ‘*unwritten*, and therefore uncertain and curious.’⁴⁴

To speak of the incarnation without respect to sin is also ‘contradictory to the Scripture’ because the Scripture everywhere declares that God’s purpose of sending his Son to be incarnate and the Son’s willingness to take flesh were with a view to human redemption. To think of this grand act of the Father and Son occurring ‘without respect unto the redemption and salvation of sinners, is to contradict and enervate the whole design and revelation of God in the Scripture.’⁴⁵

Finally, it is ‘*destitute of any solid spiritual reason.*’ It is significant, in light of the hermeneutical principle that will be discussed below, that Owen understands the need for reason. He concludes, however, that this opinion is contrary to spiritual reason.⁴⁶

⁴⁰ Aquinas, *Summa*, 3.3.

⁴¹ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:21.

⁴² Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:22 (emphasis original).

⁴³ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:22.

⁴⁴ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:22.

⁴⁵ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:24.

⁴⁶ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 18:24.

Tracing Goodwin's thought in the context of the Medieval theologian John Duns Scotus and the theologians within Goodwin's own tradition, Calvin and Owen, thus enables us to probe both Goodwin's Christology and his hermeneutic.

Building on the criticisms of both Calvin and Owen, it can be said that at certain points in his Christology Goodwin appears to move beyond exposition of Scripture to speculation, to posit theological positions that are not taught in Scripture. This speculation leads Goodwin to posit a hard distinction between the person and work of the second person of the Trinity.

But it might be argued by Goodwin that this position can be argued for on the basis of the principle of 'good and necessary consequence'.

Goodwin and Good and Necessary Consequence

The litmus test the Westminster Divines formulated (and with which, presumably, Goodwin agreed) concerning what is to be believed regarding the whole counsel of God proves to be helpful here:

The whole counsel of God, concerning all things necessary for his own glory, man's salvation, faith, and life, is either expressly set down in scripture, *or by good and necessary consequence may be deduced from scripture.*⁴⁷

George Gillespie (1613-48), one of the Scots commissioners to the Westminster Assembly, articulated and defended this principle. He notes four important considerations at the beginning of his exposition.⁴⁸ In the first place he observes that without this principle many truths which the Reformed Church holds against false teachers must be renounced. Secondly, consequence drawn out by human reasoning does not mean faith is grounded on human reasoning but on the truth of God that reasoning unravels. Thirdly, the reason employed must be reason captivated and subdued to the obedience of Christ. Finally, Gillespie makes an important distinction between consequences that are necessary and certain and consequences that are merely agreeable to the Scripture. It is possible for a

⁴⁷ *Westminster Confession of Faith*, 1:6 (emphasis mine). Cf. Francis Turretin, *Institutes*, I.XII.

⁴⁸ George Gillespie, *A Treatise of Miscellany*, 238-245. The heading of the chapter reads: 'That necessary consequences from the written word of God, do sufficiently and strongly prove the consequent or conclusion, if theoretical, to be a certain divine truth which ought to be believed, and if practical, to be a necessary duty, which we are obliged unto, *jure Divino*.'

consequence to be good but not necessary; consequences must be both good and necessary before they can be asserted as divine truth.⁴⁹

With this discussion as the backdrop, we can examine some of the distinctive points of Goodwin's Christology and assess them in the light of this Reformed principle.

Goodwin is clearly willing to speak dogmatically about matters that Scripture does not specifically address as he infers them from his Christocentric supralapsarian system.

Goodwin's editors, Thankful Owen and James Barron, comment in their *Preface to the Reader*, that Goodwin

had a genius to dive down into the bottom of points which he intended to treat of; to 'study them down,' as he used to express it, not contenting himself with superficial knowledge, without wading into the depths of things.⁵⁰

For example, Goodwin admits the Scriptures speak less of his formulation of the relationship between the two glories of God-man than they do about the mediatorial glory of Christ.

Therefore it is the Scriptures do set forth Christ to us most thereby, *though they are not altogether silent in the other*, and thereby call and draw our thoughts and intentions most fixedly thereupon.⁵¹

Again, in his treatise on the glory of the gospel he explicitly states that the personal glory the saints see in the Beatific Vision,

the gospel treats not of, but only hints; we discern it but by collecting what glory must needs be due to that man in whom the fulness of the Godhead personally dwells. But that image of God which in Christ this gospel holds forth, is but the

⁴⁹ In the same tradition James Bannerman states the principle this way: 'In order to their being accepted as articles of faith, and really a part of revealed truth, the consequences drawn from Scripture must be *good*, or truly contained in the inspired statements from which they profess to be taken. They must also be *necessary*, or consequences that are unavoidably forced upon the mind, upon an honest and intelligent application of it to the Scripture page. If they be consequences of this kind, they must express truths which are virtually, although not in so many express words, contained in Scripture, and so share in the divine authority which all Scripture statements possess.' *Inspiration*, 587.

⁵⁰ *Memoir*, Works 2:xxvii.

⁵¹ *Of Election*, Works 9:98 (emphasis added).

hopes of that other glory, and is a lower thing than that which his person wears in heaven.⁵²

Is it proper to formulate a theology out of something the gospel does not explicitly treat but about which it only offers ‘hints’? Obviously, Goodwin is willing to do so. In fact, in the above quotation, he employs the principle of good and necessary consequence. That the saints see the personal glory of the God-man in the Beatific Vision, he writes, ‘we discern . . . by collecting what glory must *needs* be due to that man in whom the fulness of the Godhead personally dwells.’⁵³

Goodwin admits that the Scriptures do not explicitly state his thesis. However, he reasons, if the God-man has the fullness of the deity dwelling in him then his personal glory must be his chief glory. He could not have as his chief glory his work of redemption subsequent to the fall of humanity into sin because that is accidental. It is an inferior glory. Goodwin deduces that the God-man’s personal glory is chief because that would only be fitting for someone in whom the fullness of the deity dwells.

Once again we see the hard distinction between the person of the God-man and his work as Redeemer. However, Goodwin’s grounds for this assertion are not rooted in biblical exegesis but in human reasoning. It is not the explicit teaching of Scripture and, although it might not be contrary to the Scripture, neither is it deducible by such good and necessary consequence from Scripture as to compel faith.

This speculative tendency is seen in Goodwin’s handling of some of the Scripture passages he employs to undergird his position that Christ was absolutely predestined as the God-man.

For example, in his comments on Ephesians 1:4 he argues that the choice of the elect was made, not only before the existence of the world, but also ‘before the foundation of the world was laid in [God’s] decree and purpose.’⁵⁴ That is to say, the world was decreed by God in order to accomplish his intention and design for the elect. ‘God chose you before them all, and so plotted the business, that all things in this world should be so marshalled

⁵² *Glory of the Gospel*, Works 4:267.

⁵³ *Glory of the Gospel*, Works 4:267 (emphasis mine).

⁵⁴ *Ephesians*, Works 1:78.

as to further and subserve the decree of election.’⁵⁵ The creation of the world is subordinate to the choice of the elect.

He follows similar logic with regard to the choice of Christ to be God-man. He argues from 1 Peter 1:20 that Christ was foreordained by God before he ‘thought of the world.’⁵⁶

However, it is not necessary to read the phrase ‘before the foundation of the world’ in these two passages this way. Paul⁵⁷ and Peter are not speaking of the order of decrees but underscoring that what happens in time has its genesis in the decree of God which was purposed before the existence of the world, that is, in eternity.

That is evident, particularly in 1 Peter 1:20. In the previous two verses the apostle is addressing God’s provision of a Redeemer in his Son Jesus Christ. Peter stresses that this provision was planned from all eternity. In fact, he contrasts eternity and time in verse 20.⁵⁸ Whereas Christ was foreordained from eternity as the Lamb of God, he has now, in time, been revealed. Peter addresses, not the order of the decrees of God, but the pre-temporal choice of the Redeemer and the temporal revelation of him in the days of his incarnation.

It is also salutary to note from this passage that the election of Christ and his work of redemption are closely connected. It was Christ, the Lamb of God, the mediator of the elect, who was chosen before the foundation of the world.

In Goodwin’s thinking, since Christ was foreordained to be the God-man before God thought of the world, it is also true that he was foreordained before God thought of humanity and the fall into sin. That is, there were other reasons for the assumption of human nature than the recovery of fallen sinners. A logical issue arises here. How can God foreordain the God-man without thinking of man? How can Christ and the elect be considered apart from the contemplation of the world? Surely Christ, the God-man, elect

⁵⁵ *Ephesians, Works* 1:79.

⁵⁶ *Ephesians, Works* 1:78.

⁵⁷ See O’Brien, *Ephesians*, 98.

⁵⁸ See Michaels, *1 Peter*, 66-67.

humans, and the world which the God-man is to create and in which the elect are to live, cannot be abstracted from one another but must be seen as a concatenated whole.

We can further highlight the distinctive nature of Goodwin's speculative tendency by comparing and contrasting his exegesis with that of a number of contemporary divines. It is important to concede that Goodwin attempts to ground each distinctive glory in Scriptural exegesis and, further, that his exegesis directs him to formulate a hard distinction between the twofold glory of the God-man. The intention of this exercise is not to demonstrate whether Goodwin's conclusions are either a minority or majority position among his contemporaries, but simply to show that other divines within his own theological tradition draw different exegetical conclusions from the same passages.

Thomas Manton (1620-77), a fellow Commissioner to the Westminster Assembly, differs from Goodwin, in his comments on both Colossians 1:15 and John 17:5. For Goodwin, Paul's statement that Christ is the 'firstborn of every creature' is a reference to his predestination as the God-man. It is thus a reference to what he thinks of as his personal (in distinction from his essential) glory. But Manton understands Paul to be speaking of his essential nature. '[M]ark, he is called the first-born, not first created, which must be understood of his divine nature, and eternal Generation of the Father before all creatures.'⁵⁹ When Paul writes 'For by him were all things created' he is not referring to the God-man who is a creature as to his humanity, but to his divine nature as the Creator of all things.⁶⁰ To make the contrast more pointed, where Goodwin might say, 'By the God-man all things were created,' Manton would say, 'By God, the second person of the Trinity, *who would one day become the God-man*, all things were created.' Goodwin sees the second person having a distinct existence, a modality even, as God-man, apart from his incarnation.

A similar contrast is seen in Manton's comments on John 17:5, 'And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory I had with thee before the world was.' Like Goodwin he notes that here the God-man is making his request in his capacity as the mediator and he is asking for the glorification of both natures. However, Manton's view is that what Christ prays for is that his divine nature will be more clearly manifested than it was during the incarnation (when it was obscured). He also prays that his human nature be

⁵⁹ Manton, *Christ's Eternal Existence*, 41.

⁶⁰ Manton, *Christ's Eternal Existence*, 42.

‘raised to the full fruition of the glory of the divine nature, and freed from those infirmities to which, by the exigence of Christ’s office upon earth it was subjected.’⁶¹ What is noteworthy here is that although he can write, ‘Christ had a double glory—the glory of his person, and the glory of his office’⁶² Manton does not abstract the glory of his person, as God-man, from the glory of his office in the way Goodwin does. Goodwin has Christ requesting his Father to give him the ‘glory, which I the man had with thee in the idea of this glory, in the predestination of me, ordained unto me before the world.’⁶³

Thomas Hooker (1586-1647) is even more explicit in his comments on John 17:5. In *A Comment upon Christ’s last Prayer in the Seventeenth of John*⁶⁴ he writes that the glory Christ had with the Father before the world ‘must needs be the glory which did appertain unto him, as God: For his Human Nature was not before the world; and therefore did not, nor could not partake of any glory.’⁶⁵

Thomas Brooks (1608-80), commenting on the same verse, speaks of the restoration of his essential glory which, by agreement, was obscured during the time of his humiliation and that his human nature might ‘be exalted to what glory finite nature is capable of.’⁶⁶

Similarly, William Bridge (1600-70) states: ‘No sooner did he come unto the Father, but he was invested with all that glory that he had with God the Father from all eternity, which he had laid by and vailed, when he took our nature upon him.’⁶⁷

What is clear from these comparisons is that Goodwin comes to these passages of Scripture with a different set of presuppositions from these contemporaries. His conclusions are grounded on the presupposition of the existence of the God-man, as God-man, because he is considered so in the predestination of God prior to his actual

⁶¹ Manton, ‘*Sermons Upon John XVII*’, 186.

⁶² Manton, ‘*Sermons Upon John XVII*’, 189.

⁶³ *Knowledge, Works* 4:484.

⁶⁴ Hooker, *A Comment*, 327. It bespeaks Goodwin’s collegiality with the Puritan brotherhood that, despite his distinct views, he was one of the signatories, along with Philip Nye, of the Epistle to the Reader commending ‘this quickening and Heavenly Exposition’ of Christ’s prayer.

⁶⁵ Hooker, *A Comment*, 327.

⁶⁶ Brooks, *Paradice*, 128.

⁶⁷ Bridge, *Christ and the Covenant*, 7.

incarnation. Therefore, this God-man, predestinated as such, can be seen as the Creator and as having a glory abstracted from his mediatorial work.

By contrast, Manton, Hooker, Brooks, and Bridge, proceed on the assumption that the second person of the Godhead, although he was foreordained from all eternity to become the God-man, has no personal glory as the God-man until his incarnation in time. In their view, before the incarnation of the second person of the Trinity, the only glory the Son of God had was his essential glory as a member of the Godhead. This conviction means that, unlike Goodwin, they do not posit a hard distinction between a personal and a mediatorial glory such that Christ, as God-man, is seen abstracted from his mediatorial work.

Although Goodwin engages with Scripture, on the basis of the Reformed hermeneutical principle of good and necessary consequence, we must judge that his contemporaries were on safer hermeneutical and logical ground. His bifurcation of the person and work of Christ is not both a good and necessary consequence that can be deduced from Scripture. Here Goodwin moves beyond exposition to speculation.

Saying More and Less

Had Goodwin followed more carefully the Reformed hermeneutical principle of good and necessary consequence which he affirmed in both the *Westminster Confession of Faith* and *The Savoy Declaration* he might have said both *more* and *less* in response to the hypothetical question whether there would have been an incarnation if humanity had not fallen.

We noted above that Goodwin once affirmed that ‘all things are ordained to fall out no otherwise than they do.’⁶⁸ At this juncture he seems to have been non-committal on the question of an incarnation apart from the fall. But at this point he should have said *more*. He should have stated Scripture’s unswerving commitment to linking the incarnation with the need for human redemption.

While Scripture emphasises the pretemporal nature of the purposes of God in Christ it also consistently presents the incarnation as God’s saving response to human sin and as

⁶⁸ *Ephesians, Works* 1:99.

the expression of his desire to redeem fallen humanity. This is well illustrated by the words of 1 John 3:8: 'For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil.' The manifestation of the Son of God in human flesh presupposes the creation and the subsequent fall of Adam by the instigation of the devil. In none of the six instances in his corpus⁶⁹ where Goodwin handles this passage, does he offer any comment on John's purpose statement. Nor does he comment anywhere in his work on the purpose clause in 1 John 3:5: 'And ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins.'

Goodwin recognises that 'Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same' (Hebrews 2:14), seems to contradict his position that Christ was ordained to have a human nature apart from any consideration of the fall. The writer of Hebrews appears to ground the incarnation in the need for human salvation. But Goodwin responds that this apparent contradiction is 'easily answered.'⁷⁰ Flesh and blood refers to the 'frailties of human nature' resulting from human sin.⁷¹ His point is: had there been no human sin, Christ's human nature would have had a different character, but the Son of God would still have had a human nature.

It is at this point that Goodwin should have said *less*. In its material on creation, the fall, redemption, and the post resurrection appearances of the God-man, Scripture does provide us with resources to attempt to envisage the nature of the glorified body of Christ. But to state, as Goodwin does, that without the fall into sin the incarnation of Christ would have been in the form his glorified body now has, is to move beyond exposition to a measure of speculation. The only incarnation the Scripture treats of is the one that actually occurred when 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners' (1 Timothy 1:15). To teach a different incarnation other than the one the Bible presents is to speculate.

Thus in one instance Goodwin refuses to engage the hypothetical question, yet in other instances he describes what the incarnation would have looked like had there been no fall. He refuses to engage in one hypothesis while promoting another. The question then arises: does not evading one hypothetical question without engaging Scripture, lead to other hypotheses not explicitly grounded in Scripture? This is the case with Goodwin. With

⁶⁹ *Ephesians*, Works 2:51, 108; *Knowledge*, Works 4:423; *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:47; *The Holy Ghost*, Works 6:441; *Of Gospel Holiness*, Works 7:254.

⁷⁰ *Ephesians*, Works 2:422.

⁷¹ *Ephesians*, Works 2:422.

regard to the hypothetical question Goodwin should have said both *more* and *less*. Had he followed the Reformed hermeneutical principle in the first instance he would have been prevented from contradicting it in the second. That is, had he stated what the Scriptures do say regarding the incarnation, that it was God's response to human sin, he would not have gone beyond Scripture in affirming an incarnation without consideration of the fall.

In another context Goodwin writes:

I will not take upon me 'to intrude into things which I have not seen,' but shall endeavour to speak safely, and therefore warily, so far as the light of Scripture and right reason shall warrant my way.'⁷²

That is a sage intention, but Goodwin does not seem to follow it through consistently, particularly in relation to the incarnation of Christ.⁷³

As we have suggested, this speculative weakness is evidenced in the hard distinction Goodwin postulates between the personal and mediatorial glories of Christ. Because he posits the Son of God being predestined God-man *chiefly* for his own glory he moves beyond the express teaching of Scripture and any necessary consequence of it.

It would have been more accurate for Goodwin to have said that the decree to elect the Son of God as the God-man was for his glory *and* the redemption of sinners without giving priority to the former over the latter.⁷⁴ This would have followed the contours of Scripture more closely. As Owen points out, 'the assumption of human nature absolutely is expressed as a great condescension, as it was indeed, Phil. ii. 5-8, and that which served for a season to *obscure* the glory of the Deity in him that assumed it, John xvii. 5.'⁷⁵

⁷² Works, 4, *The Heart of Christ*, 143.

⁷³ In this connection Daniel P. Horan makes a telling comment about one of Scotus's predecessors, Robert Grosseteste (1168-1253): 'While scripture provides the impetus for inquiry and the context for Grosseteste's initial presentation of the necessity of the Incarnation, he quickly discovers it necessary to move beyond the Sacred Page. . . . This speculative exercise remained a cautious one for Grosseteste because he was weary (*sic*) of too strongly asserting an answer unsupported by revelation or authoritative theologians.' *How Original*, 379. Because of this, Horan writes, 'Grosseteste was hesitant to assert too strongly his conclusions by way of hypothesizing.' *How Original*, 382.

⁷⁴ Benjamin B. Warfield's comments on the incarnation are apropos. He recognises that there have been a variety of attempts to account for the incarnation, including ontological and ethical, and goes on to say that the proximate account 'is to be found only in the needy condition of man as a sinner before the face of a holy and loving God.' *The Principle of the Incarnation*, 142.

⁷⁵ Owen, Works, Vol. 18, 23 (emphasis original).

Goodwin is right in saying that Christ has more glory than that which accrues to him from his work of redemption for sinners,⁷⁶ but he errs in contemplating the glory of the God-man ‘simply considered and abstracted from the work of redeeming us men from sins and wrath.’⁷⁷ The personal and mediatorial glories are glories in so far as they are conjoined, not as they are abstracted from each other. There was glory for the Son in the assumption of humanity but that was due to the ends accomplished by that assumption, namely, the declaration of the glory of God in the salvation of sinners. The God-man ‘is highly exalted . . . and given a name which is above every name’ (Philippians 2:9) because he humbled himself to become obedient unto death. Incarnation and subsequent glorification are connected by Christ’s faithfulness to the *pactum salutis* arranged from all eternity amongst the persons of the Godhead.

Not Ultimately Fatal

These are significant strictures on the speculative element in Goodwin’s Christology. Yet his view on the absolute predestination of Christ as God-man is not ultimately fatal, either to his Christology or the pastoral usefulness of his theology. It is a strand that runs through his corpus but not a strand that if tugged on would unravel his life’s work.

Not Ultimately Fatal to his Christology

It is, however, a strand that raises questions about how comfortably the mediatorial work and, therefore, the mediatorial glory of Christ fits within his system. Goodwin clearly expresses his view that Christ was first predestinated God-man, absolutely considered. This was first in God’s intention, his primary plot, that Christ should be, as God-man, the head of the elect. That this personal glory of Christ is chief and eclipses his mediatorial glory in Goodwin’s view has been demonstrated in chapter 4 above.⁷⁸

The question can be raised why God should then ordain the fall of Adam into sin. Goodwin’s answer is that this ‘after plot’ was to increase the glory of his Son Jesus Christ. Not only would the God-man have an *inherent* glory because of the assumption of a human nature, he would also have an *acquired* glory resulting from his ordination to the

⁷⁶ *Knowledge, Works* 4:454.

⁷⁷ *Knowledge, Works* 4:455.

⁷⁸ See above, 51-69.

mediatorial office and his subsequent work as Redeemer. God appointed the fall ‘as a means to improve Christ.’⁷⁹

Goodwin refers in this context to the strategy of romance writers who have a design—to have a man and woman marry—and then devise a thrilling story in which the way to that first intention is strewn with such misfortunes and disasters that the reader is left wondering if the initial goal will ever be realised. But, in the end, love conquers and this ‘happy catastrophe’ endears the lovers to each other and the story to its readers.⁸⁰

In a similar way, God intended Christ and his Church to be united forever in love. He then ordains the fall into sin and sends Christ, already considered as God-man, to be the Redeemer, with the result that ‘this plot of redemption was but a further improvement or edition of the love of God and of Christ.’⁸¹ In this way, Christ receives a double glory, one arising out of his person, the other arising out of his work.

At this stage these two plots appear to fit together, narrating a grand story of the love of God, both for humanity and for his Son. The Son of God, loved by the Father, deserves to have his glory multiplied and God ordains that to happen in manifold ways. But whether the two plots sit together comfortably in Goodwin’s theology is rendered questionable by other emphases present in his thinking.

For example, as noted above,⁸² Goodwin describes the Beatific Vision in the eschaton as the elect focussing on the personal glory of the God-man. His mediatorial glory will be set aside when his mediatorial kingdom is. In this connection, Goodwin states that John’s vision of the Lamb who was slain to redeem the elect to God by his blood, Revelation 5:6, is a reference to his coronation at the right hand of God upon his ascension to heaven to rule the world. This scene, then, is not to be understood as describing the activity of the saints throughout the entire eschaton. According to Goodwin, ‘Revelation [i.e. the New Testament book] . . . is the acting over of the story of the world that was to come,’⁸³ that is, it describes what will occur throughout history from the coronation of

⁷⁹ *Of the Creatures, Works* 7:87.

⁸⁰ *Ephesians, Works* 1:121.

⁸¹ *Ephesians, Works* 1:121.

⁸² See above, 67-69.

⁸³ *Ephesians, Works* 1:473.

Christ until the final judgment. Thus, the saints praising Christ for his mediatorial glory in Revelation 5:6 should not suggest that they will behold his mediatorial glory for all eternity after the great Day of the Lord. Rather, he poses a question, ‘Oh, my brethren, when you are in heaven and when sin shall be forgotten . . . what will be the sweetness forever?’ and answers it with this: ‘That he is your head.’⁸⁴ This was first in God’s intention and is last in execution.

It is at this juncture that we need to probe the cohesion of the romance story analogy. Does this elevation of Christ’s personal glory, abstracted from his mediatorial glory, not make his mediatorial glory somewhat superfluous, or, at most, an interim arrangement? It is, at best, incomplete, inferior, and temporary. It is incomplete because Christ has more glory than he possesses in his mediatorial role; inferior because his personal glory outshines his mediatorial glory; temporary because in the eschaton following the final judgement we shall be taken up with Christ’s personal glory alone. Thus, at times Goodwin’s comments on the necessity of Christ’s mediatorial glory amplify how tenuously his mediatorial work and glory hold together within his Christological scheme.

For example, in the context of affirming that sin was the occasion for ‘the office of Redeemer and Saviour [being] superadded in his election to that of headship’⁸⁵ Goodwin insists that God could ‘have immediately, upon the first creation of each of us, have taken us into that glory. . .’⁸⁶ The elect could have enjoyed eternal life, that is, the Beatific Vision, without the fall, ‘considered as pure creatures, through union with [the person of the God-man], and needed not his death to have purchased them for us.’⁸⁷ At one point Goodwin, echoing Chrysostom’s marvel that God should give his beloved Son to be slain, suggests that perhaps God should have let his first plot stand, that is, let the elect be glorified apart from human sin and Christ’s mediatorial work. ‘He might have chosen whether he had done so or no; he might have made us as happy in heaven as now we shall be; it needed not have cost him the blood of his Son.’⁸⁸ Thus, if God had willed the elect to remain unfallen they still would have enjoyed glory through union with the God-man, absolutely considered. Furthermore, at certain points in his corpus Goodwin argues that the

⁸⁴ *Ephesians*, Works 1:544.

⁸⁵ *Of Election*, Works 9:98.

⁸⁶ *Of Election*, Works 9:97.

⁸⁷ *Of Election*, Works 9:98.

⁸⁸ *Ephesians*, Works 1:123.

glorification of the elect, even considered as fallen, did not require the death of Christ. If we follow the Carter/Lawrence timeline of Goodwin's major works then it was the mature Goodwin who in various places stated that God could have pardoned the fallen elect without the death of Christ.⁸⁹ From this point of view, in Goodwin's scheme, with his insistence on the absolute predestination of the God-man, the mediatorial work of Christ, and therefore his mediatorial glory, holds its place tenuously.

Does this mean that Goodwin's Christocentric supralapsarianism as to end is fatal to his Christology? No, because Goodwin is fundamentally committed to expositing the Scriptures. At times this commitment means that there may be some inconsistency. For example, although Christ lays down his mediatorial glory at the end of his mediatorial kingdom, Goodwin says that he will sit eternally upon the throne 'like a mighty and glorious conqueror'⁹⁰ because of his mediatorial work. 'Although redemption shall be forgotten . . . and sins remembered no more'⁹¹ Christ remains crowned forever with the honour of being mediator. This means that the elect who will behold his personal glory cannot help seeing his mediatorial glory as well.

Goodwin's commitment to Scripture saves his Christocentric supralapsarianism as to end from rendering a fatal wound to his Christology. Although at times his thought is clearly speculative, he nevertheless recognises that the Scriptures speak primarily of Christ's mediatorial work,⁹² although not silent on his personal glory, and therefore his mediatorial work should take up most of believers' thoughts. Goodwin in fact follows this sage advice and the bulk of his work deals with humanity as fallen into sin and with Christ as the sole mediator of God's elect.

Not Ultimately Fatal to his Pastoral Usefulness

This commitment to replicating the emphasis of Scripture in his teaching also ensures that, in the main, Goodwin's work is pastorally useful. At times, however, because of his commitment to the absolute predestination of the God-man and the resultant

⁸⁹ Cf. *Ephesians*, Works 1:126; *Christ the Mediator*, Works 5:76; *Of Gospel Holiness*, Works 7:195.

⁹⁰ *Ephesians*, Works 1:505.

⁹¹ *Knowledge*, Works 4:566.

⁹² *Of Election*, Works 9:98.

bifurcation of his person and work, Goodwin appears to suggest his own distinctive form of a two-tier Christian experience.

The elect's first introduction to Christ is to his work and mediatorial glory because 'our being miserable and sinful is that which is our present and immediate concern, which we are most solicitous about in this world, whilst we are sinners.'⁹³ But there is something behind Christ's mediatorial glory that is 'hidden to our thoughts at first' but which will fully occupy our hearts and minds after the final judgement and for all eternity.⁹⁴ This experience of Christ's personal glory, the Beatific Vision, some saints experience in this life, but it is not common. Goodwin tells Christians who have not attained to such heights as the contemplation of Christ in his personal glory to 'be not discouraged; the apostles themselves had it not thus in their thoughts when Christ prayed for this for them; their faith and their spirits had been little carried forth to, and exercised about, this union.'⁹⁵ Some saints receive some experience of the joys of heaven in this life but it is not given to every believer.⁹⁶

For Goodwin, normally the believer experiences the work of Christ as redemptive mediator in this life and, in the eschaton, he delights in the person of the God-man. Here, it would seem, a bifurcated Christology leads to a bifurcation in Christian experience.

In this particular context, John Owen is a surer guide. In his *Meditations and Discourses on the Glory of Christ*,⁹⁷ Owen discusses John 17:24 and answers the question, 'What is the glory of Christ which he wishes his elect to behold?' He answers that 'the glory of Christ is the glory of the person of Christ.'⁹⁸ So far he appears to be tracking with Goodwin. He further writes, 'The person of Christ may be considered two ways:—1. *Absolutely* in itself. 2. In the *susception* and discharge of his office, with what ensued thereon.'⁹⁹ Again, these two ways appear to correspond to Goodwin's personal and mediatorial glory of the God-man. However, according to Owen, the glory of the person of

⁹³ *Of Election*, Works 9:98.

⁹⁴ *Of Election*, Works 9:114.

⁹⁵ *Of Election*, Works 9:114. Goodwin is referring to Christ's prayer in John 17:22: 'And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one.'

⁹⁶ *Knowledge*, Works 4:383.

⁹⁷ Owen, Works, Vol. 1:273-415.

⁹⁸ Owen, Works, Vol. 1:293.

⁹⁹ Owen, Works, Vol. 1:293 (emphasis original).

Christ includes the assumption and carrying out of his mediatorial office alongside what he is, absolutely, in himself. There is, for Owen, no other glory of Christ than the glory of his person as he is the God-man *and* mediator.

As we have seen, while Owen does not explicitly refer to Goodwin,¹⁰⁰ he does criticise the view he held on the Beatific Vision. That view envisages the elect beholding the personal glory of the God-man distinct from his mediatorial glory. In addition, we have seen that in Goodwin's teaching few saints are able, in this life, to attain to such lofty views of the God-man. Owen turns this completely on its head: 'No man ought to look for anything in heaven, but what one way or other he hath some experience of in this life.' Either directly, or implicitly, this constitutes a rejection of Goodwin's bifurcation of the usual Christian experience vis-à-vis the beholding of Christ's glory? He writes:

I have seen and read somewhat of the writings of learned men concerning the state of future glory; some of them are filled with excellent notions of truth, and elegance of speech, whereby they cannot but much affect the minds of them who duly consider what they say. But I know not well whence it comes to pass, many complain that, in reading of such discourses, they are like a man who 'beholds his natural face in a glass, and immediately forgets what manner of man he was;' as one of old complained to the same purpose upon his perusal of Plato's contemplations about the immortality of the soul. The things spoken do not abide nor incorporate with our minds. They please and refresh for a little while, like a shower of rain in a dry season, that soaketh not unto the roots of things; the power of them does not enter into us. Is it not all from hence, that their notions of future things are not educed out of the experience which we have of the beginnings of them in this world? Without which they can make no permanent abode in our minds, nor continue any influence upon our affections. Yea, the soul is disturbed, not edified, in all contemplations of future glory, when things are proposed unto it whereof in this life it has neither foretaste, sense, experience, nor evidence.¹⁰¹

Owen's theology of the incarnation and of the Beatific Vision does not posit a God-man predestinated absolutely for himself and his own glory. The incarnation is for the purpose of redemption. It does have additional purposes but they should never be separated from this. Connecting the person and work of the God-man in this way more closely

¹⁰⁰ Robert Halley compares and contrasts Thomas Goodwin, John Owen, and Richard Baxter: 'Though there was little cordiality between Baxter and Owen, they both esteemed Goodwin—the former respectfully, the latter affectionately.' *Memoir, Works* 2:xlvi. Perhaps this explains, in part, why Owen does not reference Goodwin. Owen's discourse was first published in 1684, that is, four years after Goodwin's death and one year after Owen's.

¹⁰¹ Owen, *Works*, Vol. 1:290.

follows the biblical contours and is therefore less speculative and promotes a more unified Christian experience of communion with Christ.

Conclusion

To say that Goodwin's insistence that Christ was absolutely predestined as the God-man is not ultimately fatal to his Christology and pastoral usefulness perhaps does not convey the encomium his work deserves. It is true that his work presents a bifurcated Christ and a bifurcated Christian experience. This might appear to disqualify him from serving as a safe guide for believers. However, the overall profound commitment to the content of the Scriptures that pervades his theology preserves him from the more speculative and less balanced elements embedded in his theology.

Despite these reservations, our examination of Goodwin's treatment of the threefold glory of Christ has set in sharp relief the multifaceted glory of the second person of the Holy Trinity, and specifically the glory of his person. The eternal Son of God, who as God has an essential glory, has, by God's decree, assumed a human nature and, now and forever, the glory of God has become visible in the God-man. Christ, the God-man, has all the fullness of the Godhead dwelling in him bodily. We owe a debt to Goodwin for drawing our attention to, and drawing out our adoration for, the magnificence of his person. As Jones writes: 'He, more than perhaps any of his British contemporaries, had an intense focus on the glory of the God-man, Jesus Christ.'¹⁰²

In addition, Goodwin's emphasis that this second person of the Trinity, who is glorious in himself as God, and who has a super-added glory as the God-man, also has an additional glory as the mediator of God's elect is salutary. Undoubtedly his Christology and pastoral theology would have been strengthened if he had more closely linked the person and work of the God-man, that is, if he had highlighted that the God-man has no glory as God-man except that he is God-man *and* Redeemer of God's elect.¹⁰³ But it would be both unwarranted and ill-advised to neglect the immense contribution Thomas Goodwin

¹⁰² Beeke and Jones, *A Puritan Theology*, 159.

¹⁰³ Warfield acknowledges that there are elements of truth in differing accounts of the incarnation but states they should not be studied atomistically or independent of each other. He writes: 'Rather, they form parts of one closely concatenated sphere of truth, the center of which lies in the soteriological Incarnation of the Bible; and it is only as each finds its proper place as a segment of the great sphere of truth formed about that constitutive face, that it possesses any validity, or even indeed reaches to the height of its own idea.' *The Principle of the Incarnation*, 143.

makes to our understanding of Jesus Christ. For his Christology has constantly in view the goal of doxology, and that the whole church should share in his own heart-felt ascription:

Even so be it, O blessed and thrice glorious Lord Jesus; to whom be glory for ever.
Amen.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁴ *Knowledge, Works* 4:456.

Appendix A: The Dating of Goodwin's 'Grand Project'¹

In his abstract introducing his PhD dissertation Jonathan Mark Carter acknowledges that his study in Goodwin's soteriology

builds upon Michael Lawrence's historical reassessment which uncovered that . . . the majority of Goodwin's treatises were composed during the 1650s and intended to form a grand project defending reformed soteriology.²

Most of Carter's decisions noted in the following is grounded on Lawrence's historical reassessment. It will be noted where Carter diverges from Lawrence.

Goodwin's 'Grand Project'

Carter notes that after his departure from Oxford Goodwin devoted himself to his 'grand project.' During the Laudian years, prior to emigrating to the Netherlands, while publishing works of practical divinity he, 'first envisaged a much greater project . . . comprising a comprehensive exposition of salvation in Christ.'³ Returning to England in the early 1640s Goodwin began preaching through Ephesians 1:1-2:11 to a gathered Church in London and then found himself pulled into public life, preaching to the Parliament and becoming a member of the Westminster Assembly. In the 1650s he was president of Magdalen College, Oxford. There Goodwin preached sermon series 'that could be collected together into his grand project.'⁴ Although forced to refute the opponents of the Reformed faith, Carter notes that 'Goodwin's basic concern remained to promote godliness.'⁵

With the accession of Charles II and Goodwin's return to London, he had opportunity to devote himself to his 'grand project.' In addition to spending his time in

¹ This appendix is heavily dependent on Jonathan Mark Carter's work, particularly his first chapter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 1-44, and his Appendix B, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 357-363.

² Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, v.

³ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 4.

⁴ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 5.

⁵ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 5.

‘prayer, reading, and meditation’⁶ Carter suggests that ‘he likely undertook the final editing process during these years [although] his grand project was not published . . . until the years following his death in 1680.’⁷

Carter notes that Goodwin’s writings were co-opted by his son and ‘pressed to endorse congregationalism’⁸ and the scheme of the grand project remained hidden until Lawrence’s ground-breaking work.

Dating the ‘Grand Project’

In an appendix to his dissertation Carter lists the seven treatises that comprise Goodwin’s grand project, treatises which are also significant to this present thesis. The ‘bulk of the treatises were largely written, but not edited, before 1660.’⁹

The seven works of the grand project are:

1. *Of the Creatures, and the Condition of their State by Creation*.¹⁰ Carter dates this to the 1650s.¹¹
2. *An Unregenerate Man’s Guiltiness Before God, in Respect of Sin and Punishment*.¹² Carter writes: ‘In conclusion, this treatise was largely composed in the late 1620s, but later expanded, quite possibly in the 1650s.’¹³
3. *Man’s Restoration by Grace*.¹⁴ Carter writes: ‘It does not appear possible to date this short treatise.’¹⁵

⁶ *Memoir*, Works 2: lxxiii.

⁷ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 6.

⁸ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 8.

⁹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 9.

¹⁰ *Works*, 7:1-128.

¹¹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 358. For Carter’s reasoning for his and Lawrence’s dating of these works, consult Appendix B, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 357-369.

¹² *Works*, 10:1-567.

¹³ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 360.

¹⁴ *Works*, 7:519-541. Carter remarks that this third treatise was expanded by the three following treatises.

¹⁵ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 360.

4. *A Discourse of Election*.¹⁶ Carter concludes that parts should be dated to the mid-1650s, with other parts dated near the end of that decade.¹⁷
5. *Of Christ the Mediator*.¹⁸ Carter dates this to the 1650s.¹⁹
6. *The Work of the Holy Ghost in our Salvation*.²⁰ Carter concludes that this treatise ‘largely began life as a series of sermons delivered in Oxford during the 1650s, but following the Restoration Goodwin inserted at least one extra section.’²¹
7. *Of the Blessed State of Glory which the Saints Possess After Death*.²² Carter states that the bulk of this treatise may be dated to the mid-1650s with the final chapter being almost identical to a sermon printed in 1638.²³

Other Writings Referred to in this Thesis

1. *The Glory of the Gospel*.²⁴ The sermons are dated to the mid-1620s while the treatise written between 1627-1634 while Goodwin was still in Cambridge.²⁵
2. *Ephesians*.²⁶ These sixty sermons were delivered in London before the convening of the Westminster Assembly.²⁷

¹⁶ *Works*, 9:1-498.

¹⁷ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 360.

¹⁸ *Works*, 5:1-436.

¹⁹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 361.

²⁰ *Works*, 6:1-522.

²¹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 363.

²² *Works*, 7:336-471.

²³ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 364.

²⁴ *Works*, 4:225-346. His editor notes: ‘Under the common title, “The Glory of the Gospel,” Goodwin left two works, the one consisting of two sermons, and the other of a treatise divided into eight chapters.’ *Works*, 4:226.

²⁵ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 364-365.

²⁶ *Works*, 1:1-564; *Works*, 2:1-467.

²⁷ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 367.

3. *The Knowledge of God the Father and his Son Jesus Christ*.²⁸ Carter dates this to the early 1650s.²⁹
4. *Of Gospel Holiness*.³⁰ Carter suggests a date of late 1650s.³¹
5. *The Heart of Christ in Heaven*.³² Karl R B Jones lists this as being printed for the first time in 1641 in London.³³
6. *Christ Set Forth*.³⁴ Karl R B Jones list this work as being printed for the first time in 1642 in London.³⁵

Goodwin and Polemics

Carter affirms the ‘overall contentions of Lawrence’s work’ but differs from him in the ‘prominence he grants to the Socinian threat.’³⁶ Carter acknowledges that Goodwin addresses Socinian error but that there were other opponents he sought to refute. In addition to addressing the Socinians, as he does, for example, in *Of Christ the Mediator*,³⁷ Goodwin also speaks to the ‘[o]pinions of the popish doctors, of the Arminians, and of some enthusiasts.’³⁸ As is evident from Goodwin’s writings, he is an equal opportunity critic.

However, although Goodwin addresses different errors throughout his theological career, as Carter notes, ‘his work lacks a strongly polemical tone,’³⁹ leading him to conclude:

²⁸ *Works*, 4:347-569.

²⁹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 367.

³⁰ *Works*, 7:129-336.

³¹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 369.

³² *Works*, 4:93-150.

³³ Jones, *Goodwin Joy*, Appendix One, 133.

³⁴ *Works*, 4:1-91.

³⁵ Jones, *Goodwin Joy*, Appendix One, 133.

³⁶ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 15.

³⁷ *Works*, 5:123, 424.

³⁸ *The Holy Ghost*, *Works* 6:187.

³⁹ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 14.

It is, therefore, preferable to understand Goodwin as defending against a range of threats, whilst true to his original intentions, being chiefly motivated by the promotion of godliness.⁴⁰

This irenic spirit is echoed by Robert Halley in his memoir of Goodwin. Although, with regard to church polity, Goodwin differed with the majority of the Westminster Assembly, ‘his Christian temper and gentle deportment conciliated the esteem of all.’⁴¹

⁴⁰ Carter, *Partakers of his Divine Nature*, 17.

⁴¹ *Memoir*, *Works* 2:xxviii.

Bibliography

- Anselm. "Why God Became Man." In *A Scholastic Miscellany: Anselm to Ockham*. The Library of Christian Classics, Ichthus Edition, 100-183. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1956.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *The Summa Theologica of St. Thomas Aquinas. Part III*. Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. London: R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1913.
- Augustine. *Confessions*. Translated with an introduction by R. S. Pine-Coffin. New York: Penguin Books, 1961, reprinted 1986.
- Augustine. "Tractates on the Gospel of John." In *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series*, Vol. 7. Translated by John Gibb. Edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1888. Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight. <http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/1701.htm>.
- Augustine. *The Works of Saint Augustine: A translation for the 21st Century: Sermons III/5 (148-183) on the New Testament*. Translation, and notes by Edmund Hill, O.P., edited by John E. Rotelle, O.S.A. New York: New City Press, 1992.
- Bannerman, James. *Inspiration: the infallible truth and divine authority of the Holy Scriptures*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1865.
- Barker, William S. "Thomas Goodwin (October 5, 1600-February 23, 1680)." In *Puritan Profiles*, 70-77. Fearn, Ross-shire, Scotland: Mentor, 1996.
- Baynes, Paul. *An Entire Commentary upon the whole epistle of St Paul to the Ephesians wherein the text is learnedly and fruitfully opened with a logical analysis, spiritual and holy observations, confutation of Arminianism and Popery and sound edification for the diligent reader*. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1866.
- Beeke, Joel R. and Mark Jones. *A Habitual Sight of Him: The Christ-Centered Piety of Thomas Goodwin, Profiles in Reformed Spirituality*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2009.
- Beeke, Joel R. and Mark Jones. *A Puritan Theology: Doctrine for Life*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.
- Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology*, Fourth Revised and Enlarged Edition. Grand Rapids: Wm B. Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1949.
- Blackham, Paul. "The Pneumatology of Thomas Goodwin." PhD. Diss., King's College, 1995.
- Bridge, William. *Christ and the covenant the work and way of meditation*. London, 1667.
- Brooks, Thomas. *Paradice opened, or the secreets, mysteries, and rarities of divine love, of infinite wisdom, and of wonderful counsel, laid open to publick view*. London, 1675.

- Calvin, John. *Genesis*. Translated by John King. 1847 Calvin Translation Society. 2 vols. in 1 vol. A Geneva Series Commentary. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1965.
- Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. 2 Vols. The Library of Christian Classics Volume XX. Edited by John T. McNeill, Translated and Indexed by Ford Lewis Battles. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1960.
- Calvin, John. "Commentaries on the Catholic Epistles," in *Commentaries XXII*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981.
- Carter, Jonathan Mark. "'Partakers of his Divine Nature': The Reality of Union with Christ in Thomas Goodwin's Defence of Reformed Soteriology." Ph.D. diss., The University of Edinburgh, 2016.
- Dean, Fr. Maximilian Mary, FI. *A Primer on the Absolute Primacy of Christ: Blessed John Duns Scotus and the Franciscan Thesis*. Bedford, MA: Franciscans of the Immaculate, 2006.
- Edwards, Jonathan. "A Dissertation Concerning the End for Which God Created the World." In *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, vol. 1, pp. 94-121. Edinburgh: Banner of Truth Trust, 1974.
- Ferguson, Sinclair B. and David F. Wright, eds. *New Dictionary of Theology*. Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 1988.
- Fesko, J. V. "The Westminster Confession and Lapsarianism: Calvin and the Divines." In *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century: Essays in Remembrance of the 350th Anniversary of the Westminster Assembly*, edited by Ligon Duncan. Vol. 2. Fearn, Ross-shire, Scotland: Mentor, 2004.
- Gillespie, George. *A Treatise of Miscellany Questions: Wherein Many Useful Questions and Cases of Conscience are Discussed and Resolved; for the Satisfaction of Those, Who Desire Nothing More, Than to Search for and Find out Precious Truths, in the Controversies of These Times*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh, 1969.
- Goodwin, Thomas. *The Works of Thomas Goodwin*, 12 vols. Edinburgh: James Nichol, 1861-66. [Reprinted] Eureka: Tanski Publications, 1996.
- Helm, Paul. *John Calvin's Ideas*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Herzer, Mark. "Adam's Reward: Heaven or Earth?" In *Drawn into Controversie: Reformed Diversity and Debates Within Seventeenth-Century British Puritanism*, edited by Michael A G Haykin and Mark Jones, Reformed Historical Theology. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2011, 162-182.
- Hooker, Thomas. *A Comment Upon Christ's Last Prayer in the Seventeenth of John. Wherein is opened, The Union Beleivers have with God and Christ, and the glorious Priviledges thereof*. London: Peter Cole, 1656.

- Horan, Daniel P. "How Original was Scotus on the Incarnation? Reconsidering the History of the Absolute Predestination of Christ in Light of Robert Grosseteste." *The Heythrop Journal* 52 (2011): 374–91. doi:10.1111/J.1468-2265.2010.00580.X.
- Horton, M. S. "Thomas Goodwin and the Puritan Doctrine of Assurance: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Reformed Tradition, 1600-1680." Ph.D. diss., Wycliffe Hall, Oxford & Coventry University, 1995.
- Ingham, Mary Beth. *Scotus for Dunces: An Introduction to the Subtle Doctor*. Saint Bonaventure, NY: The Franciscan Institute, 2003. Kindle Edition.
- Jones, Karl Rupert Barker. "The Theology of Christian Joy in the Works of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)." MA Thesis, University of Durham, 2011.
- Jones, Mark. "Why Heaven Kissed Earth: The Christology of Thomas Goodwin (1600-1680)." Ph.D. diss., Leiden University, 2009.
- Letham, Robert. *The Holy Trinity: in Scripture, history, theology, and worship*. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing Company, 2004.
- Manton, Thomas. "Sermons Upon John XVII." In *The Complete Works of Thomas Manton, D.D.* Vol. X. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1872.
- Manton, Thomas. *Christ's Eternal Existence, and the Dignity of his Person Asserted and Proved. In Opposition to the Doctrine of the Socinians*. In *Several Sermons on Col. 1.17, 18, 19, 20, 21 Verses*. London, 1685.
- McGraw, Ryan M. *By Good and Necessary Consequence*. Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2012.
- Michaels, J. Ramsey. *1 Peter*. Word Biblical Commentary, vol. 49. Waco: Word, 1988.
- Moody, Andrew. "That All May Honour the Son: Holding Out for a Deeper Christocentrism." *Themelios* 36.3 (2011): 403-14.
- Muller, Richard A. *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms: Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Sources*, 2nd Edition. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2017.
- Muller, Richard A. *Post-Reformation Reformed Dogmatics: the rise and development of Reformed Orthodoxy, ca. 1520- ca. 1725*. 4 Vols. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *The Letter to the Ephesians*. The Pillar New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Owen, John. *The Works of John Owen*, edited by William Goold. Vol. 1. Edinburgh and London: Johnstone and Hunter, 1850-53; reprinted., London: Banner of Truth, 1965.
- Owen, John. *The Works of John Owen*, edited by William Goold. Vol. 10. Edinburgh and London: Johnstone and Hunter, 1850-53; reprint ed., London: Banner of Truth, 1965.

Owen, John. *The Works of John Owen*, edited by William Goold. Vol. 18. Edinburgh and London: Johnstone and Hunter, 1854; reprint ed., London: Banner of Truth, 1991.

Packer, J. I. *A Quest for Godliness: The Puritan Vision of the Christian Life*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1994.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition, A History of the Development of Doctrine: Reformation of Church and Dogma*, Vol. 4. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983.

Smeaton, George. *The Apostles' Doctrine of the Atonement*. Edinburgh: The Banner of Truth Trust, 1991.

The Racovian Catechism, with notes and illustrations, translated from the Latin: to which is prefixed a sketch of the history of Unitarianism in Poland and the adjacent countries by Thomas Rees, F.S.A. London: printed for Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, and Brown, Paternoster Row, 1818.

The Savoy Declaration of Faith.

https://reformed.org/master/index.html?mainframe=/documents/Savoy_Declaration/

Thomas, Derek W. H. "The Mediator of the Covenant (2:12-15)." In *A Theological Guide to Calvin's Institutes: Essays and Analysis*, edited by David W. Hall and Peter A. Lillback, 205-225. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 2008.

Thomas, Derek W. H. "The Westminster Consensus on the Decree: The Infra/Supra Lapsarian Debate." In *The Westminster Confession into the 21st Century: Essays in Remembrance of the 350th Anniversary of the Westminster Assembly*, edited by Ligon Duncan. Vol. 3. Fearn, Ross-shire, Scotland: Mentor, 2009.

Toon, Peter. "The Westminster and Savoy Confessions: A Brief Comparison." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 15:3 (Summer 1972): 153–60.

Trueman, Carl R. "John Owen's Dissertation on Divine Justice: An Exercise in Christocentric Scholasticism." *Calvin Theological Journal* 33 (1998):87-103.

Turretin, Francis. *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*. Edited by James T. Jr Dennison. Translated by George Musgrave Giger. 3 vols. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R Publishing, 1992.

Warfield, Benjamin B. "The Principle of the Incarnation." In *Selected Shorter Writings*, Vol. 1, 139-147. Edited by John E. Meeter. Phillipsburg: P&R Publishing, 1970.

Westminster Confession of Faith. Glasgow: Free Presbyterian Publications, 1958.

Whyte, Alexander. "Thomas Goodwin." In *Thirteen Appreciations*. Edinburgh: Oliphant, Anderson and Ferrier, 1913.

à Wood, Anthony. *Athenae Oxonienses, an exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford. To which are added The*

Fasti, or Annals of the said University. A New Edition with Additions, and a Continuation by Philip Bliss, Fellow of St. John's College. Vol. 4. London: Various Publishers, 1820.

Wood, Eric. "The Primacy of Christ: A Theological Foundation." MA Thesis, Athenaeum of Ohio/Mount St. Mary's Seminary of the West, 2015.